



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

C. Cooper

20

THE
HISTORY OF ENGLAND

VOL. II.

THE
HISTORY OF ENGLAND

VOL. II.

LONDON : PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
AND PARLIAMENT STREET

THE
HISTORY OF ENGLAND

FROM THE LANDING OF CÆSAR

TO THE REIGN OF VICTORIA

BY

EMILY COOPER


IN TWO VOLUMES

VOL. II.

LONDON
SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, AND CO.

1877

All rights reserved



NEW YORK
PUBLIC
LIBRARY

CONTENTS

OF

THE SECOND VOLUME.

CHAPTER XXVII.

JAMES I. A.D. 1603-1625.

	PAGE
The King of Scots succeeds—Catholic plot against the King—Coronation— Trial of Sir W. Raleigh—Execution of supposed criminals—A res- pite—Conference at Hampton Court—Spirited conduct of Parliament —Fines for non-attendance at church—Treatment of Mr. Pound—Gun- powder Plot—Lord Mounteagle warned—Trial of the Conspirators— Fawkes and others executed—Trial of Garnet—Sale of titles—James institutes Baronets—Cowell's 'Interpreter' denounced by Parliament —Lady Arabella Stuart—Vorstius expelled from Holland—The Martyrs—Death of Lord Salisbury—Death of Prince Henry—Mar- riage of the Princess Elizabeth to the Count-Palatine—Suspensions against Lord and Lady Somerset—Persecution of Peacham—Raleigh liberated from the Tower—His last expedition—His arrest, and execution—Courts of Star Chamber and High Commission— Frederick crowned King of Bohemia—Defeated at Prague—Lord Bacon fined and degraded—Misunderstanding between the King and Parliament—The Book of Sports—Journey of Prince Charles and Buckingham to Spain—Charles affianced to Henrietta of France—The King's death—State of Ireland—Commerce with India and North America	1

CHAPTER XXVIII.

CHARLES I. 1625-1649.

Unpopularity of Buckingham—Petition of Right—Murder of Buckingham —Imprisonment of Sir John Eliot—Laud—Wentworth—The Council of the North—Arbitrary government in Scotland—Trial of Lord Balmerino—Levy of ship-money—Resistance of Lord Say—of Hampden—Cruelty of Laud towards Leighton, Prynne, and others— Emigration to New England—Introduction of the new Service-book at Edinburgh—Disturbances—Scottish League and Covenant—Disso-	
--	--

lution of Parliament—Riots in London—The Scots cross the Border—Pacification of Ripon—New Parliament—The Earl of Strafford accused of High Treason—Archbishop Laud sent to the Tower—Triennial Bill—Trial of Strafford—Decision of the Judges—The Commons in permanent session—Strafford's execution—Marriage of the Princess Mary to the Prince of Orange—The Grand Remonstrance—The Archbishop of York and other prelates arrested—Intended arrest of the Five Members—Charles in the House of Commons—Triumphant return of the Five Members—The Queen leaves for Holland—Charles is refused admission into Hull—He raises his standard at Nottingham—Battle of Edgehill—Retires to Oxford—The Queen's return—Death of Hampden—Parliamentary League with Scotland—The Covenant subscribed by the English Parliament—Associations formed by Cromwell—Defence of Lathom House—Battle of Marston Moor—Essex capitulates—Execution of Archbishop Laud—Negotiations at Uxbridge—Broken off—Battle of Naseby—Charles repairs to the Scots at Newark—Delivered up to Parliament—Taken to Holmby—Brought to Newmarket—At Hampton Court—Escapes—A prisoner at Carisbrook Castle—Defeat of the Royalists at Preston—Negotiations at Newport—Their failure—The King's removal to Hurst Castle—The advocates of peace excluded from the House of Commons—Charles brought to Windsor—His trial and execution—Interred at Windsor

55

CHAPTER XXIX.

THE COMMONWEALTH AND PROTECTORATE. 1649–1660.

Proclamation—Sovereign authority in the House of Commons—Abolition of the House of Lords—Milton appointed Latin secretary of the Council of State—Charles II. proclaimed King at Edinburgh—Mutiny in the army—Fairfax and Cromwell receive the thanks of the City of London—Cromwell in Ireland—His military success—Convention of Breda—Cromwell's return—The expedition of Montrose—His execution—Charles in Scotland—Battle of Dunbar—Charles crowned at Scone—Invades England—Battle of Worcester—Execution of the Earl of Derby—Escape of Charles—War with Holland—Blake's victory—Cromwell dismisses the Parliament—Nominates the Barebones or Little Parliament—Cromwell styled Lord Protector—Royalist plots—Meeting of an elected Parliament—Its dissolution—Royalist conspiracy—Appointment of Major-Generals—The Vaudois—The third Parliament—Their 'petition and advice' that Cromwell be King—He declines the title—Dissolution of Parliament—Death of Cromwell—Richard Cromwell proclaimed Protector—Remaining members of the Long Parliament recalled—Resignation of Richard and Henry Cromwell—The Convention-Parliament—Declaration of Breda—Charles's letters to Parliament, the Army, and the City—Charles II. arrives in London

146

CHAPTER XXX.

CHARLES II. 1660–1685.

Accession of Charles—Bill of Indemnity—Execution of the Regicides—Lord Chancellor Hyde, Lord Clarendon—Execution of Argyle—The King's marriage to the Princess of Portugal—Act of Uniformity—

Ejection of Nonconformist clergy—Conventicle Act—Five-Mile Act— The Plague in London—Fire of London—The Dutch fleet enters the Thames—Fall of Clarendon—‘Triple Alliance’ (of England, Hol- land, and Sweden)—The Test Act—Mary, eldest daughter of the Duke of York, married to William of Orange—Murder of Sharp, Archbishop of St. Andrews—Popish Plot—The Duke of York excluded from the Council—The Habeas Corpus Act—The Exclu- sion Bill, aimed at the Duke of York, defeated—Execution of Lord Stafford—The Duke of York returns—Marriage of the Princess Anne to George of Denmark—London deprived of its municipal privileges—The Rye House Plot—Execution of Lord Russell; of Algernon Sidney—Death of the King—Colonies at Bombay and New York	201
--	-----

CHAPTER XXXI.

JAMES II. 1685–1688.

Accession of James—Punishment of Titus Oates—Argyle invades Scotland —His execution—The Duke of Monmouth invades England—His defeat at Sedgemoor—Execution—‘The Bloody Assize’—Revocation of the Edict of Nantes—Declaration of Indulgence—Offence given by Oxford University—The clergy ordered to read the Declaration— Their refusal—The Seven Bishops sent to the Tower—Trial of the Seven Bishops—Invitation to the Prince of Orange—His declara- tion—Charter of the City restored—William embarks for Eng- land—Lands at Brixham, in Torbay—The Princess Anne escapes from Whitehall—James leaves London, but afterwards returns— James takes refuge in France—Convention—Parliament meets— Declaration of Right—Formal offer of the Crown—Accepted by William in the presence of Mary—Hospitable reception of James by Louis XIV.	246
--	-----

CHAPTER XXXII.

WILLIAM AND MARY. 1689–1702.

Accession of William—Coronation of William and Mary—Act of Toleration —James in Ireland—His address to the Irish Parliament—London- derry relieved—Battle of Killiecrankie—Death of Lord Dundee— Count Schomberg at Westminster—Edmund Ludlow in England— Obliged to depart—Act of Grace—William commands in Ireland— Battle of the Boyne—James leaves Ireland—Teignmouth burned by the French—Williams returns to England—The Non-jurors corre- spond with Louis XIV.—Treaty of Limerick—Massacre of Glencoe —Renewed danger of invasion—Battle of La Hogue—Commence- ment of ‘The National Debt’—Death of Mary—Intended assassina- tion of William—Declaration of Parliament in support of the King— Peace of Ryswick—Arrival of the Czar Peter—Death of the Duke of Gloucester—Act of Settlement—The reversion of the Crown settled on the House of Hanover—Death of James—His son proclaimed King by order of Louis—Death of William	292
--	-----

CHAPTER XXXIII.

ANNE. 1702-1714.

PAGE

Accession of Anne—War with France—Marlborough and Eugène— Victory of Blenheim—Capture of Gibraltar—Union of England and Scotland—The Stuart Prince's attempted invasion of Scotland— Death of Prince George—Siege of Lille—Trial of Dr. Sacheverell— Bill against 'Occasional Conformity'—Charles withdraws from Spain —Becomes Emperor of Germany—Peace of Utrecht—The Queen's death	342
---	-----

CHAPTER XXXIV.

GEORGE I. 1714-1727.

Accession of George I.—Declaration of James Stuart, the Pretender— Death of Louis XIV.—The Earl of Mar's rebellion—Invasion of England—Capitulation at Preston—James Stuart lands in Scotland —His escape to France—Spanish force landed in Scotland—Arrest of Atterbury—'The South Sea Bubble'—Disgrace of Lord Chancellor Macclesfield—Sudden death of the King	362
--	-----

CHAPTER XXXV.

GEORGE II. 1727-1760.

Accession of George II.—The House of Commons prohibit publication of their debates—Porteous riots at Edinburgh—Death of Queen Caroline—Anson's voyage round the world—Sir Robert Walpole re- signs—Is created Earl of Orford—War between Maria Theresa and Frederick of Prussia—George II. takes the field—Battle of Dettingen —Charles Edward Stuart lands in Scotland—Battle of Preston Pans— The Prince reaches Derby—His retreat—His defeat at Culloden— Escapes to France—Death of Frederick Prince of Wales—'The New Style'—Trial and execution of Admiral Byng—Commencement of the 'Seven Years' War'—Mr. Pitt's Ministry—Quebec taken from the French—Death of General Wolfe—Canada conquered—Conquests in India—Robert Olive—Olive's victory at Plassey—Death of the King—John Wesley, founder of Methodism	377
--	-----

CHAPTER XXXVI.

GEORGE III. 1760-1810.

Accession of George III.—His immediate popularity—His marriage to the Princess Charlotte of Mecklenburg—Pitt's resignation of office ; succeeded by Lord Bute—End of the 'Seven Years' War'—Ad- vantages obtained by England—Lord Bute's resignation—Arrest of John Wilkes for a libel in 'The North Briton;' liberated, but expelled from the House of Commons, and outlawed—Complaint of the use of 'General Warrants'—Resolution passed against their use —Mr. Grenville's proposal to levy the stamp-duty in America—Im- provements in English manufactures; Wedgwood, Arkwright, and

others—Opposition to the stamp-duty in America defended by Pitt— Repeal of the Stamp Act under Lord Rockingham's Administration— Pitt returns to power as Earl of Chatham—Debates first allowed to be reported in newspapers—The tea taxed by England thrown into the sea at Boston, in America—War between England and America —Battle of Bunker's Hill—Declaration of American Independence —Alliance of America and France—Death of Lord Chatham—For- midable riots in London excited by Lord George Gordon—Surrender of Lord Cornwallis, the British commander in America—Resolution of the House of Commons against the continuance of the American war—Marquis of Rockingham's second Administration—Defence of Gibraltar—Peace concluded with the United States—Mr. Fox's India Bill—Mr. Pitt's Ministry—Warren Hastings, Governor- General of India—His despotic conduct—He resigns his office—His prosecution—Hastings' defence—Impeachment—Trial—The King's illness—The French Revolution—Opening of the States-General— Attack on Dr. Priestley's house—Execution of Louis XVI.—War between England and France—Trials of Horne Tooke and others— Marriage of the Prince of Wales—Expedition to Quibéron Bay— Mutiny of the Nore—Naval victories of Lords Howe, St. Vincent, and Duncan over the French, Spaniards, and Dutch—Irish Rebellion— Bonaparte's expedition to Egypt—Battle of the Nile—Bonaparte returns to France—His letter to George III.—Parliamentary Union with Ireland—Pitt retires—Addington Prime Minister—Peace of Amiens—Renewal of war—Enrolment of Volunteers—Pitt returns to office—Napoleon Bonaparte Emperor—His coronation—His second letter to George III.—Battle of Trafalgar—Death of Nelson—Im- peachment of Lord Melville—Death of Pitt—Mr. Fox takes office under Lord Grenville—His death—Intended abolition of slavery— Battle of Jena—The Berlin Decree—Treaty of Tilsit—Bombardment of Copenhagen and seizure of the Danish fleet—Portugal threatened by the French—The Prince Regent of Portugal departs—Joseph Bonaparte King of Spain—Sir Arthur Wellesley appointed com- mander of the English troops sent to Portugal—Sir John Moore advances upon the French communications, but is compelled to retire by General Soult—Retreats to Corunna, is attacked by the French, and is slain in battle—Bravery shown by the Spaniards at Saragossa —Battle of Talavera—Wellesley receives the title of Lord Wellington —Failure of the British expedition to Walcheren, in Holland— Jubilee held in England on October 25, when the King began the fiftieth year of his reign—Marriage of the Emperor Napoleon to the Archduchess Marie Louise of Austria—The King's incapacity	410
---	-----

CHAPTER XXXVII.

THE REGENCY—GEORGE IV. 1810–1830.

The Regency—Second American war—Napoleon invades Russia—The retreat—Lord Wellington in Spain—The Emperor of Russia and King of Prussia enter Paris—Napoleon's abdication—Peace—Wellington raised to a dukedom—Receives the thanks of Parliament—Napoleon at Cannes—War renewed—The Duke of Wellington commander of the allied army—Battle of Waterloo—Capitulation of Paris—Resto- ration of the Bourbons—Louis XVIII.—Napoleon conveyed to St. Helena—Lord Exmouth's attack on Algiers—Death of George III.— Popular education—Prison reform—Howard—Mrs. Fry—Severity of Government—Encouragement of the Arts—Accession of George IV. —Trial of Queen Caroline—Her death—Repeal of the Test Act— Catholic Emancipation—The King's death	478
---	-----

CHAPTER XXXVIII.

WILLIAM IV. 1830—1837.

	PAGE
Accession of William IV.—French Revolution—Charles X. dethroned— Earl Grey's Ministry—Reform Bill—Poor Law Reform—Negro Emancipation Act—The King's death	495

CHAPTER XXXIX.

VICTORIA.

Accession of Victoria—Marriage—Repeal of the Corn Laws—Louis Philippe abdicates—The electric telegraph under the ocean— Alliance of England and France with Turkey—War with Russia— Peace—Indian Mutiny—Distress in the North of England	501
---	-----

INDEX	507
-----------------	-----

HISTORY OF ENGLAND.

CHAPTER XXVII.

JAMES I.

A.D. 1603—1625.

ELIZABETH expired at Richmond early on March 28, 1603. The succession was to the last moment undetermined, when she signified her wish to the ministers in attendance that King James should succeed her. The sovereign of England had no legal power to dispose of the crown, except by the advice of Parliament. That power Parliament had conferred on Henry VIII., and in the exercise of it he had done his best to exclude the House of Stuart, preferring next to his direct heirs, the line of the Suffolk family. But Elizabeth had steadfastly discouraged the aspirations of Lady Catherine Grey and her descendants, and James's only possible rival was his cousin Arabella Stuart, granddaughter of the old Earl of Lennox, a descendant of the daughter of Henry VII., like himself. Her title was inferior, but she had been born on the soil of England. The popular voice was, however, decidedly in favour of the king, and confirmed the determination of the late queen's Council to proclaim his accession.¹ Sir Robert Cary, a distant relation of Elizabeth, lost no time in carrying the welcome intelligence to Scotland. Leaving London early on Thursday, he arrived at Edinburgh on Saturday night, just after the King of Scots had retired to rest. But the door of the royal chamber quickly reopened to the messenger who saluted James by his new title

¹ Hallam's 'Constitutional History,' i. 289.

of King of England, Scotland, France and Ireland; and on the next morning Cary was desired to name his reward. He modestly requested in reply, the appointment of gentleman of the bedchamber, and entered at once upon the duties of his office.

Meantime the Council, without any expectation of the king's presence, issued orders for the late queen's funeral.

The voluntary attendance of fifteen hundred persons in deep mourning, who followed the remains of their queen to Westminster Abbey on April 28, testified that, although Elizabeth's popularity had in some degree diminished towards the end of her reign, her memory was still fondly cherished.

England, however, after having been during fifty years ruled by female sovereigns, gladly hailed the accession of a king; while James was eager to leave Scotland, where he had been continually thwarted by the levelling principles of the clergy and the factious spirit of the nobles.¹

After delivering an appropriate farewell address, in which he promised his Scottish subjects never to forget that he was their native prince, James commenced on April 5 his journey to the more wealthy and civilised realm which desired his presence, leaving his queen, Anne of Denmark, and his three children, to follow him.

The king's progress from Berwick to London resembled a triumphal procession; noblemen and gentlemen came forward to offer gifts or hospitality, and mayors and corporations brought addresses and purses of gold. James, indeed, declared to his Scottish attendants with exultation that they had entered the Promised Land. He was received with much hospitality at Hinchinbrook, in Huntingdonshire, the seat of Sir Oliver Cromwell, a wealthy and generous gentleman, whom Elizabeth had visited, and who was styled in the country 'the golden knight.' He was the uncle and godfather of the celebrated Lord Protector, but himself never wavered in his loyalty to the crown.² 'Marry, mon,' said the king to his host in broad Scotch, 'thou hast treated me better than any one since I left Edenborough.'

James also stayed four days at Theobalds, the princely seat of Sir Robert Cecil, near Cheshunt, in Hertfordshire, where he confirmed Cecil in his office as Secretary of State, received the homage of other ministers, and conferred on several persons the

¹ Lingard, ix. 3.

² This Sir Oliver, in consequence of his loyalty to Charles I., was sentenced by Parliament to lose his estates, but his powerful nephew interfered in his favour, and they were preserved.—See Forster's 'Life of Oliver Cromwell.'

honour of knighthood.¹ Business, however, demanded the king's early attention, and the addresses presented to James before he reached London were not all mere courtly effusions of congratulation.

The diminution of Elizabeth's popularity in her latter years was mainly owing to the rigour with which she maintained the established ritual in all points, some of which were highly disapproved by the increasing number of those strict Protestants styled Puritans. As soon as James crossed the Scottish border he was assailed by petitions for religious toleration, both from the Catholics who hoped to find favour in the eyes of Mary Stuart's son, and from the Puritans who expected to find a friend in one who had been carefully educated in the theology of Geneva, and had repeatedly expressed his conviction 'that he belonged to the purest Kirk in the world.' On his way to London he received what was called the Millenary Petition, intended to be signed by 1,000 clergymen, and to which 825 ministers from twenty-five counties subscribed their names. This petition contained no demand inconsistent with the maintenance of the Established Church, but prayed that certain ceremonials might be discarded which they deemed superstitious and Popish. James, however, who rejoiced to exchange the republican forms of the Kirk for the ritual of a Church which owned its sovereign as its head, showed no inclination towards these petitioners.²

Thus, even before the new king entered London, his popularity was on the wane.

Both Queen Mary and the unfortunate Darnley had been remarkably handsome, but James was awkward in his gait and unprepossessing in his countenance, showing no indications of that manly spirit which his subjects so highly valued. He repulsed common people, who flocked to see him, with a roughness which strongly contrasted with the kind demeanour of Elizabeth during her progresses; and at Newark he gave a remarkable proof of his ignorance of, or disregard for, the English law, by ordering that a pickpocket who had been caught in the act, should be immediately hanged without trial. Although his new subjects did not openly remonstrate, this act met with the disapprobation that it deserved. 'I hear that our new king,' said Sir John Harrington, 'hanged one man before

¹ Sir Robert Cecil, first made a baron, was created Earl of Salisbury in 1605, and three years later became Lord High Treasurer. His elder brother, Lord Burleigh, was made Earl of Exeter in 1605.—Aikin's 'James I.,' i. 232.

² Hallam, i. 296.

he was tried; it is strangely done,—if the wind bloweth thus, why may not a man be tried before he has offended ?'¹

Besides James's unprepossessing appearance, his speech was so strongly Scottish as to surprise his English subjects. He had been carefully instructed in Latin by the celebrated Buchanan, who had insisted that 'a sovereign ought to be the most learned clerk in his dominions;' but he chiefly valued his learning for occasions of display, and his pedantry exposed him to the ridicule of the accomplished men who had formed part of Elizabeth's court.

It was May 7 when James entered London. Six Scotsmen were immediately admitted to the Council, the first place in which was given to Robert Cecil, second son of the late Lord Burleigh; Lord Cobham and Sir Walter Raleigh were deprived of their offices, and political dissensions arose from the first. Foremost among the ambassadors who came to congratulate the new king was the Duke of Sully, minister of Henry IV. of France, who had prepared himself and his suite with mourning dresses in honour of the late queen. But when this was intimated to James, he showed so much annoyance that Sully reversed his orders.² 'There are among the chief public men,' writes Sully from England, 'seditious persons ready to undertake anything in favour of novelty, were it even against the king himself.' In fact, a pretext, or a leader, was alone wanting to kindle an insurrection against the sovereign, even before his coronation.³

Influence among the higher classes of any nation was in those days frequently bid for and purchased by bribery under the guise of presents. Sully endeavoured by presents to the queen and courtiers to induce the King of England still to afford aid to the States of Holland; while Aremberg, ambassador of the Archduke, the ruler of the Spanish Netherlands, came to England to obstruct the French influence, and to purchase an interest for Spain in the Council.

From the accession of Elizabeth there appears to have been a Spanish party among the English Catholics, ready to indulge in visionary schemes for the sake of their religion. In fact, before the queen's death James had been warned of their intention to bring forward the Infanta Isabella, daughter of Philip II., on the absurd plea of her descent from Eleanor, daughter

¹ Hallam, i. 296, note.

² Miss Aikin's 'Memoirs of James I.,' i. 113.

³ The opinion prevailed that an attempt made against an uncrowned king did not involve its authors in high treason.

of Henry II., who was married to the King of Castile. This Spanish princess was now the wife of the Archduke.¹ But the greater part of the Catholics preferred the title of the Lady Arabella, who, although neither Catholic nor ambitious of sovereignty, might be gained, it was presumed, by a proposed marriage with the Duke of Parma's brother. This project had been favoured by Pope Clement VIII., who was assured that the direct ascendancy of Spain would neither be endured by the English nation nor permitted by the King of France. The Pope had prepared two briefs, to be delivered to the chief English Catholics after the death of Elizabeth, not naming any candidate for the throne, but exhorting them to accept no sovereign who would not promise to support the Roman Catholic worship. These briefs were intrusted to the care of Garnet, the superior of the Jesuits at Brussels, who, after the undisputed accession of James, prudently burned them.²

The persecution of the Catholics during the long reign of Elizabeth had led to secret associations, hotbeds of disloyalty towards the government. According to a Catholic historian, there was no county of England where might not be found several of the clergy of Mary's reign, commonly called 'the old priests.' They were frequently chaplains in private families, and sometimes ventured to administer the solemn rites of their religion at the dead of night, in private chambers or retired spots.³ In the last year of Elizabeth's reign, Thomas Winter, as the representative of the Spanish faction, had negotiated with the ministers of Philip III. as to the invasion of England. Although the Catholics as a body had approved of James's succession, certain discontented persons were still ready to join in conspiracy, and a priest named Wright was sent from England, and Guido Fawkes,⁴ from Flanders, to sound the intentions of Spain. The Spanish court, however, was still desirous of peace; but the conduct of James soon increased the number of the discontented. Before his accession the king had appeared to favour toleration; now, however, it was discovered that all 'recusants' were to continue paying the penalty of £20 per month. Upon which a priest named Watson, once favourably received by James in Edinburgh, conceived the notion of surprising him on his way to the hunt, and of extracting from his fears a change of ministry, and a measure of toleration.

¹ See Jardine's 'Criminal Trials,' i. 305.

² Lingard, viii. 389. Hallam's 'Constitutional History,' i. 287.

³ Hallam, i. 121, with reference to Dodd's 'Church History,' vol. ii. p. 8.

⁴ The well-known 'Guy Fawkes,' a military man serving abroad, and of respectable English parentage.

Another priest named Clarke joined in this scheme, to which they tried to obtain the concurrence of the Catholic gentry, urging that so long as the king had not been crowned the attempt could not be styled high treason, and that they designed no injury to his person. Their chief confederates were Sir Griffin Markham and Mr. Copley, Catholics; George Brooke, brother of Lord Cobham, a turbulent, unprincipled man; and Lord Grey of Wilton, a leader among the Puritans, who is said nevertheless to have wished to extricate himself, when he found the plot to have been instigated by zealous Roman Catholics. The more influential of these, however, refused to co-operate in the scheme.

This conspiracy went by the names of the 'Bye Plot,' the 'Treason of the Priests,' or 'The Surprise.' It was planned that a number sufficient to overpower resistance should seize the king, under pretence of securing his safety from alleged enemies, when on his way from Greenwich to Windsor, and convey him to the Tower; or, should they fail to gain admittance there, to Dover Castle, then under the command of Lord Cobham, the Warden of the Cinque Ports.¹

This strange design, most perilous to those engaged in it, 'the greater part of whom,' as Sully observed, 'agreed in nothing but their common discontent,' was first frustrated by the king's earlier and unexpected departure to Windsor. Other disappointments followed, till Watson, despairing of success, had just recommended the abandonment of the enterprise, when a Jesuit named Gerard revealed the secret to Cecil, who arrested Copley and the other associates, and by private examinations obtained complete proof of their guilt.

From finding Brooke, the brother of Lord Cobham, among the conspirators, Cecil was led to suspect Cobham, also Cobham's friends, Northumberland and Raleigh. Cobham and Raleigh had been excluded from the Council; Raleigh had been deprived of his honourable post of captain of the guard, which had been bestowed upon one of the king's Scottish favourites, and of his valuable monopoly for the sale of wine. It was not impossible that a man of his daring temper might under provocation embark on even so desperate an enterprise; moreover, it came to the knowledge of the government that Cobham had held several conferences with Count Aremberg, the ambassador from the Netherlands, with the supposed object of obtaining

¹ Although 'the Bye Plot' appears scarcely credible, the original declarations of the conspirators, which are preserved at the State Paper Office, prove the truth of these statements; and Watson admitted that he hoped to become lord chancellor, the distribution of other high offices having been arranged among themselves. — Jardine, i. 392.

a large sum of money from the King of Spain, in order to place the Lady Arabella Stuart on the throne. The principal evidence against Raleigh was that of Lord Cobham, who afterwards withdrew his statements, but it was sufficient to justify sending them both to the Tower to await their trial for high treason. This alleged conspiracy was distinguished from 'the Bye Plot' by the name of 'the Main,' or 'the Spanish Treason.' James had fixed that his coronation should take place on St. James's day, July 25, and although the plague was raging in London, he would not consent to any postponement. It was performed by the Archbishop of Canterbury with small attendance, and less than the usual parade, after which James immediately retired into the country, the infection still pursuing the court from one place to another. In November those implicated in the late conspiracies were brought to trial at Winchester. Sir John Harrington, Elizabeth's godson, wrote to the Bishop of Bath and Wells, with much anxiety for Raleigh, whom he much esteemed. 'In good truth,' said he, 'I pity his state, and doubt the dice not fairly thrown if his life be the losing stake.'¹

Raleigh's trial took place on November 17, before a special commission. He was charged with joining in a conspiracy to kill the king, with intent to change the religion and subvert the government. The charges set forth that it had been arranged for Lord Cobham to apply to the King of Spain and the Archduke of Austria for money, in order to support Arabella Stuart's title to the throne, to ensure peace with Spain and the toleration of the Catholic religion. The Lady Arabella, who was present at the trial, declared, through her friend the Lord Admiral Nottingham, 'that she never dealt in any of these things;' and Lord Cecil, one of the commissioners, confirmed her words, desiring that none should scandalise so innocent a lady.² The Attorney-General, Sir Edward Coke, abused Raleigh with indecent virulence, whilst the prisoner, by his calmness and temper, so won upon the hearts of all present that although, owing to the part he was supposed to have taken against the Earl of Essex, he had been previously hated, he was now generally pitied and even admired.³

Raleigh protested against the belief that he could think of attacking a state so strong as England had now become, being 'united to Scotland whence we were wont to fear all our troubles.' 'I was not,' said he, 'such a madman as to make

¹ Miss Aikin's *Memoirs*, i. 140.

² Jardine's *'Criminal Trials,'* i. 434. This was Lord Robert Cecil.

³ *Ib.* 451.

myself in this time a Robin Hood, a Ket, or a Jack Cade. I knew also the state of Spain well, his weakness. I knew that six times we had repulsed his forces—thrice in Ireland, thrice at sea; and once at Cadiz on his own coast. Thrice had I served against him myself at sea, wherein I had expended of my own properties £4,000.’ In all his former courses, as Raleigh truly declared, he had been opposed to Spain; he had opposed the peace with that power, yet he acknowledged that Lord Cobham had told him what large sums of money would be given by Spain to such statesmen as should be ready to maintain peace. Again and again he entreated to be confronted with Lord Cobham, which was as steadfastly denied him. The most damaging evidence against him was, that being promised a pension of £1,500, he had agreed to inform the Spanish court of the intentions of England as to Spain and the Netherlands. This charge, which Sir Walter could not altogether deny, made the rest of the accusation the more credible.¹ The jury were not long before bringing in their verdict of ‘Guilty of Treason,’ and the lord chief justice pronounced sentence of death in the usual form. It has been said, however, that ‘some of the jury were afterwards so touched in their conscience as to ask Raleigh’s pardon on their knees.’²

With regard to the pension of £1,500 a year, Raleigh said in court, ‘I cannot deny the offer, but it was never my purpose to accept it; it was my fault I did conceal it, and this I acknowledge; but for attempting or conspiring any treason against the king or the state, I will deny it to the death, and it can never be proved against me.’

The continual attempts of Spain to obtain influence at the English court, even among the ladies, appear from a lively letter of Arabella Stuart to her uncle the Earl of Shrewsbury, in which she relates that the Spanish ambassador had bestowed ‘great store of Spanish gloves and hawks’ hoods on the lords and ladies, taking occasion with petty gifts and courtesies to win soon-won affections.’

In the first distress of mind caused by his apprehension, Raleigh had tried to stab himself, which induced in many persons the stronger suspicion of his guilt, but this was not brought forward by the attorney-general, whose violent and bitter language was, however, generally blamed. After his conviction, Sir Walter wrote an admirable letter to his wife, which goes far to refute the charge of atheism brought against him at his trial, to which he did not condescend to reply. He thanked

¹ Jardine, 449.

² *Ib.* quoted from Osborne’s ‘Memoirs of James I.’

her for all her love and care, expressing his hope that she might not be tried 'with extreme poverty.' His land had been already settled on his son. Domestic happiness had indeed ended for Raleigh, but that fate which appeared immediately impending was yet in the distance.¹

Watson, Clarke, and Brooke suffered the extreme penalty of the law. On December 9, Sir Griffin Markham, one of the conspirators in the Bye Plot, was brought upon the scaffold, but when expecting immediate death, he was led away for a respite of two hours. Next came Lord Grey, attended by many friends, and prepared to meet death with great composure; but he was informed by the sheriff that he must withdraw for awhile, as Lord Cobham must first be executed. Lord Cobham came forward with good courage, expressed his sorrow for his offence, but insisted that as to Raleigh his testimony was true. His demeanour on the scaffold, so much more firm than had been expected of one believed to be weak, made it appear that 'it is an easier matter to die well than to live well.'² By the sheriff's direction, Markham and Grey were now brought back to the scaffold, all the three 'looking strange one upon the other, like men beheaded, and met again in the other world.' Then the sheriff addressed them on the heinous offences for which they had been so justly condemned, concluding with 'See the mercy of your prince, who of himself hath sent to countermand, and given you your lives.' The audience gladly joined in acclamations; 'no man could cry loud enough—"God save the king;"' and Cobham and Grey protested that they would never again engage in treason. Raleigh, adds the narrator, being in a room with a window looking that way, could reason on 'the meaning of this stratagem.' His turn was appointed for the following Monday, but the king had determined to confine him in the Tower of London with the two lords, there to remain during the royal pleasure.

Markham, Brooksby, and Copley were sentenced to banishment.³

According to Cecil's statement, this grace was entirely the king's act; the warrant to stay execution being sent from the sovereign's bedchamber. It received the hearty approval both of the assembled multitude and of the court; but the prisoners

¹ Raleigh's letter to his wife is inserted by Mr. Jardine in his first volume of 'Criminal Trials,' p. 453.

² The words of Sir Dudley Carleton, in a long letter describing the extraordinary scene of which he was a witness.—Jardine, i. 474.

³ Sir Dudley Carleton's letter is preserved in the Hardwicke Papers.

had nearly experienced all the anguish of death, and as their sentences still remained in force, their lives depended on the king's pleasure.¹ Nor was theirs a merciful destiny. An affecting letter has been preserved, addressed to Lord Salisbury (Cecil), by Lord Grey, nearly eight years after his first arrest, imploring permission to take a little exercise for his health's sake, a boon which he declared to have been more freely allowed the other prisoners in the Tower. Grey at length died in prison, having been confined for eleven years. Lord Cobham was liberated after several years of confinement, but died in extreme poverty in 1618, in a small lodging kept by his former laundress.²

Cases of severe and protracted imprisonment were frequent at this period. On looking over the returns, says Mr. Jardine, which the lieutenant of the Tower was required to make of his prisoners, the same names recur during 'a long series of years, frequently until upon the death of the individual, or some political change, his name disappears from these calendars of misery.'³ Well satisfied with the recent exhibition of his royal clemency, James began the next year of his reign with displaying his theological learning. The Puritans had presumptuously petitioned for a reformed liturgy and other changes in the government of the Church. By the king's command, four of their leading ministers were invited to meet him and the bishops for conference at Hampton Court on January 14.

The first day of this celebrated assembly was spent by James in discourse with the most orthodox of his bishops, he expressing his conviction that the throne itself would totter should their order be abolished. The debate began on the 15th, and Dr. Reynolds, a learned Puritan minister, had the honour of arguing in Latin with the king. According to Sir John Harrington, who was present, and who was no Puritan, James talked much Latin, but his scholarship was particularly apparent in upbraiding his opponents. At times he broke into invective against the party which in Scotland had persecuted both his mother and himself. He even threatened the Puritans that he would 'make them conform themselves, or else *harrie* them out of the land, or else do worse.'⁴ 'It was easy for a monarch and eighteen Churchmen,' says Hallam, 'to claim the victory, be the merits of the dispute what they might, over four abashed and intimidated adversaries.'⁵ James

¹ See 'Lives of British Statesmen,' Cecil; and Lingard, ix. 21.

² Jardine, i. 477.

³ 'Criminal Trials,' i. 476.

⁴ Fuller's 'Church History,' book x. 18.

⁵ 'Constitutional History,' i. 297.

soon afterwards issued a proclamation, desiring the heads of the Church to enforce conformity, and threatening innovators. A palpable violation of the civil rights of the subject ensued, in the commitment to prison of ten persons who had signed the Millenary Petition, the judges having in the Star Chamber declared that petition to be an offence very nearly amounting to treason, as it tended to sedition and rebellion. 'By such beginnings,' says Hallam, 'did the House of Stuart indicate the course it would steer.'¹

It was far easier and much more agreeable to James, to silence the Puritan ministers than to encounter an English Parliament. Well satisfied with the adulation of his court, the king had made the unhealthy state of London a pretext for delaying to summon Parliament during the first year of his reign. Meantime, he was announcing maxims which he had already given to the world in his discourse 'On the True Law of Free Monarchies,' printed some time before in Scotland, in which he maintained the right of the *sovereign* to make laws *without* the advice of Parliament, and to mitigate or suspend general laws made by Parliament.² In the proclamation for calling together his first Parliament, the king directed that candidates should be avoided who were noted for blindness in religion, or turbulent humour. The sheriffs were desired not to send a writ to any town which had become depopulated, which appears a sensible provision; but all returns of members were to be brought to Chancery to be overlooked, and any members elected contrary to the meaning of this proclamation were declared liable to fine and imprisonment. The House of Commons, which had successfully maintained its privileges under Elizabeth, would not now submit to the domineering of James. The Speaker, in his first address to the king, took care to inform him that laws could not be made or altered except by the joint action of Parliament with the sovereign; that the king could ratify or deny, but could not institute any measure before it had been passed by the two Houses.³ A case concerning the privileges of the Commons was warmly contested. The Council declared the election of Sir Francis Goodwin as member for the county of Buckingham void, and appointed Sir John Fortescue. As the Commons persisted in maintaining Goodwin's right to the seat, James at length desired them to confer with the judges in his presence, when by a compromise both elections were set aside, and the Speaker issued a new writ.

¹ 'Constitutional History,' i. 298.

² *Ib.* 299.

³ Lingard, ix. 27.

The Commons thus obtained assurance of the right, which they have ever since exercised, of deciding on the merits of contested elections.¹ Strong remonstrances were made against certain exactions which descended from feudal times, especially the abuse of Purveyance, to restrain which the Commons asserted that no fewer than thirty-six statutes had been passed. Notwithstanding these, however, the impressment of carts and carriages, and the demand for provisions for the king's use still continued, no fair recompense being made in the prices paid, which were far below the true value, whilst resistance to those who enforced these claims was punished by imprisonment.

Sir Francis Bacon, afterwards the celebrated chancellor, was a member of the committee to which several of these grievances were referred, and with his characteristic feeling for the beauties of nature, declaimed against the purveyors for felling trees without the consent of the owners, 'timber-trees which are the beauty and shelter of men's houses; which men esteem for their use and delight, ten times above their value.'² Objection was also made to 'that lucrative tyranny, bequeathed by the Norman conquerors,' by which the king was allowed to hold in charge the estate of every military tenant under the age of twenty-one, without accounting for the profits.

The Lords, with whom the Commons conferred on this subject, would not allow the guardianship to be called a *wrong*, since it had been patiently endured by their ancestors, and was warranted by the law. They advised that this matter should be dropped for awhile, as somewhat unseasonable in the king's first Parliament.

The House of Commons directed a committee to prepare 'a Form of Apology and Satisfaction to be delivered to His Majesty.' This justified all those proceedings at which the king had taken offence, and clearly, 'with respectful boldness,' declared the constitutional rights of Parliament. They asserted that during the last reign, 'regard to the queen's sex and age' had caused them to pass over abuses which they now hoped to redress and rectify. 'The prerogatives of princes,' they declared, 'may easily, and do daily, grow. The privileges of the subject are for the most part at an everlasting stand; when lost, are not recovered but with much disquiet.' They declared that their customary request at the beginning of a Parliament, that they might enjoy their privileges, was 'only an act of

¹ Lingard, ix. 27, note.

² Bacon's works, i. 624. Hallam, i. 304. Bacon was knighted on the coronation-day, and was soon after this time made solicitor-general.

manners,' for 'their privileges and liberties were their right and inheritance, no less than their lands and goods.'

'Such,' says Hallam, 'was the voice of the English Commons in 1604, at the commencement of that great conflict for their liberties which is measured by the line of the House of Stuart. It is not, however, certain that the Apology was ever delivered to the king.'¹

James had inclined much more to the side of Spain than to that of the people of the United Provinces, whom he considered as rebels. The treaty of peace between England and Spain, which was agreed upon in August, 1604, containing a stipulation that no further aid should be given to the Dutch, excited general discontent in England, and was thought contrary to the national honour and the Protestant cause. 'Spain advanced in that age the most preposterous claims to an exclusive navigation beyond the tropic, and to the sole possession of the American continent,' upon which the English merchants, tempted by past good fortune, could not be restrained from trespassing.²

There was sufficient proof that the treaty was rather for the interests of Spain than those of England. Rich gifts were bestowed by Philip III. on the Earl of Nottingham, the English ambassador at Madrid on this occasion, who received a pension of 12,000 crowns; and although the Earls of Suffolk and Northampton were not accused by Parliament, their splendid mansions were openly attributed to Spanish gold.

Great was the disappointment of the Roman Catholics when, at the conclusion of the treaty with Spain, they found that no concession had been made in their favour. The rigour with which the Puritan ministers who refused to conform to the established forms had been ejected from the Church, and the distress of many who were thrown into prison for nonconformity, raised a suspicion that the king was inclined to Popery. James, who appears to have steadfastly remained a Protestant Episcopalian, endeavoured to avert this apprehension by declaring his detestation of the Romish faith, by banishing all Catholic missionaries, and by allowing large sums to be exacted from Catholic recusants, by which he was enabled at no cost to himself to supply the extravagance of many of his indigent countrymen.

By the 35th of Elizabeth, any one convicted of non-attendance

¹ Hallam's 'Constitutional History,' i. 305-7. Hallam considers this remonstrance a proof that the government of England had not become so absolute under the Tudors as some historians have represented.

² Hallam, i. 313.

at church was liable to imprisonment, and if after three months he still remained inflexible, might be compelled to abjure the realm, or be put to death.¹ By another statute,² the sum of £20 a month had been fixed as the fine for non-attendance at church, but these fines had not been lately exacted.

In 1604 the administration took a sudden turn towards severity,³ and the demands made on Roman Catholic recusants, not only for the present but for the whole time of past suspension of fines, reduced many families to absolute beggary. A further act was passed to prevent Roman Catholics from educating their children in their own faith, by making them liable to pay a fine of 40s. per day if they maintained in their houses a recusant schoolmaster, or one who had not been licensed by the bishop. The schoolmaster was liable to the same fine, and a penalty of £100 was decreed against those who should send their children to be educated on the continent. So great was the change from comparative lenity to rigour, that the sum paid by recusants, which in 1603 only amounted to £300, suddenly rose, in 1605, to £6,000.⁴

Puritanism had become predominant in Parliament, and the Puritans were influenced by a bigoted abhorrence of the faith of Rome. When Lord Montague, a Catholic peer, warmly contended against the cruelty of this act, which deprived Catholics of education, the House committed him to prison.⁵ The laws which had condemned Jesuits in Elizabeth's reign were again put in force, and it appears that several of that order were tried for their lives in Manchester and executed.

An aged Catholic gentleman of Lancashire, imprisoned for his religion during the last reign, now ventured to petition the king, complaining of the treatment to which the Catholics were exposed. Although his petition was couched in respectful language, he, Mr. Pound, was brought before the Star Chamber and prosecuted for contempt. The Lord Chancellor and the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of London, and several peers sat in judgment, by whom he was sentenced to stand in the pillory twice, to pay a fine of £1,000, and to be imprisoned during the king's pleasure. It was even proposed to add to this severe sentence the loss of his ears, but that barbarity was averted by the votes of the more humane judges. The French and Venetian ambassadors remonstrated against this severity, and Pound, after standing one day in the pillory in London,

¹ Hallam's 'Constitutional History, i. 213. Lingard, ix. 41-55.

² 29th of Elizabeth.

⁴ Jardine, ii. 19.

³ Hallam, i. 405.

⁵ Ib. 24.

was allowed to return to his own house.¹ Sir Everard Digby, a young gentleman of high position and recently knighted by James, wrote a warning letter to Lord Salisbury, concerning the discontent occasioned by these acts of rigour. 'If,' said he, 'the state think it fit to deal severely with the Catholics, within brief there will be massacres, rebellions, and desperate attempts against the king and state.' 'It was hoped that the king, that now is, would have been at least free from persecuting, as his promise was before his coming into this realm, and as divers his promises have been since his coming. All these promises every man sees broken.'

It was at this time, and under such provocation, that a plot of unexampled wickedness suggested itself to the unsettled mind of Robert Catesby.

Catesby, descended from an ancient Catholic family of Northamptonshire, had been continually suspected of taking part in seditious plots, had been imprisoned at the time of the Armada, and was an intimate associate of Garnet, the English Superior of the Jesuits.² It appears to have been in the spring of 1604 that he communicated to his friend, Thomas Winter, his scheme of blowing up the House of Lords, and thus, in retaliation for the penal laws, involving King, Lords and Commons, in one general destruction.

It is said that Winter declared the plan to be cruel, and that although Catesby partly prevailed over him, they agreed to await the hoped-for mediation of Spain before taking any further steps. But when that hope was disappointed, the scheme was renewed; John Wright, who had been concerned in the rebellion of Lord Essex, and Guido Fawkes, who had served in the Spanish army in Flanders, a man of desperate courage and fanatic zeal, were admitted as confederates; likewise Thomas Percy, steward and relative of the Earl of Northumberland, and some other gentlemen. Percy hired a house next to the House of Lords, designing to place a quantity of gunpowder in the cellar. The conspirators began their work by cutting through the wall which divided this from the cellar of the Parliament House, and as it was three yards in thickness, the labour exceeded their expectation. All the seven persons who so laboured were, as Fawkes subsequently stated, 'gentlemen of name, not any employed in digging and mining that was not a gentleman.' This labour occupied the day; they carried

¹ Lingard, ix. 41, note, and Jardine, ii. 38. Lord Salisbury is said to have been present.

² Aikin's 'James I.,' p. 236. Jardine, ii. 26.

the earth and rubbish into a little building in the garden at the back, and one stood sentinel while the others worked.

But when, after great labour, about half of the stone wall had been pierced through, they were induced to change their plan by finding that the vault directly under the House of Lords, which had been let to a coal merchant, was vacant. Percy hired this on the pretext of wanting a place for the stowage of coals and wood, and having placed there about twenty barrels of gunpowder which they covered with faggots, they desisted from their work in May, 1605, carefully closed the cellar, and determined to separate for some months to avoid suspicion, and to return before the meeting of Parliament.¹ All the conspirators afterwards declared that they intended after the catastrophe to proclaim one of the royal family as the sovereign. Prince Henry was expected to accompany his father to Parliament, and must therefore perish; but Percy undertook to secure the Duke of York, afterwards Charles I., and to place him in safety, and it was intended that the Princess Elizabeth should also be secured. A house in Warwickshire, the residence of the Grant family, was to be the centre from which the conspirators would be provided with horses and armour. Many discussions took place respecting those lords who should be saved, all agreeing that Catholics ought not to suffer with the rest; for, although the conspirators had hardened their hearts respecting this general destruction, they all wished to exempt from it their own patrons or friends. The Lords Stourton and Munteagle were Catholics, and had married sisters of Tresham, one of the conspirators, who pleaded earnestly for them. Percy interceded for the Earl of Northumberland; even Fawkes had patrons whom he wished to save.

The notice that Parliament, which had been convened for October 3, would not be opened till November 5, excited alarm among the conspirators, and they sent an associate to observe the countenances of the ministers, when they assembled to prorogue Parliament; but as the Earls of Salisbury and Suffolk were seen walking carelessly across the House of Lords in conversation, it was hoped that they still remained in ignorance of their approaching danger. The desperate office of firing the gunpowder had been allotted to Guy Fawkes. Tresham provided a ship to be ready in the Thames to convey him immediately to Flanders, where he was to publish a manifesto invoking the aid of the Catholic powers. In the early part of September, the conspirators had despatched to Rome Sir

¹ Lingard, ix. 38-40.

Edmund Raynham, a Catholic gentleman who was intimately acquainted with Catesby and others. It appears to have been their wish that he should be there at the time of the catastrophe, to negotiate with the Pope and explain their motives.¹

On Saturday, October 26, ten days before the expected opening of Parliament, Lord Mounteagle, when at supper, received a letter, left by some person unknown, with a notice that it contained matters of importance. This letter, without a signature, ill-spelt and mysterious, advised Lord Mounteagle, as he valued his life, to devise some excuse for not attending Parliament, which was about to 'receive a terrible blow, and yet they should not see who hurt them.' It is still uncertain who was the author of this warning, but those who have lately investigated the point agree with the general opinion of the conspirators, that it came from Tresham, a reluctant confederate, who appears to have anxiously desired to stop the execution of the design, if possible, without endangering himself or his associates.²

Lord Mounteagle took the letter immediately to the Earl of Salisbury, who showed it to other members of the Council. The king was absent from London on a hunting excursion, and they awaited his return. The vessel which Tresham had engaged was lying in the Thames, and he urged Catesby earnestly to depart, even offering him a supply of money; and again on the following Saturday, three days before the fatal Fifth of November, Tresham informed Winter that he had reason to know that the Council were aware of the design, and implored him in the most earnest manner to leave the country. But still, in spite of these warnings, the conspirators refused to relinquish their plot, as no search had been made in the cellar, although they held themselves in readiness to depart should they have reason to fear. Fawkes promised to visit the cellar daily, to observe whether there were any signs of its having been inspected.

At length, on the afternoon of November 4, the Lord Chamberlain, whose duty it was to see that the preparations for opening Parliament were complete, went to the House, accompanied by Lord Mounteagle, and made an excuse for examining the vaults. They observed the great store of wood and coals, and when they perceived Fawkes standing in a corner, disguised as Percy's servant, spoke to him concerning the large quantity of fuel which was stored there. Although Fawkes informed Percy of this, he returned to his dangerous post, determined,

¹ Jardine, ii. 47.

² Ib. 65-67; Lingard, ix. 52, note.

as he afterwards declared, to perish himself if needful in the fulfilment of the design. Happily, however, as Fawkes was stepping out of the door about midnight, prepared apparently for a journey, he was seized by Sir Thomas Knyvett, a magistrate of Westminster, and a party of soldiers. Three matches were found in his pocket, and a dark lantern containing a light was behind the door. The cellar was examined, and a very large quantity of powder was found beneath the fuel.

The Lords of the Council immediately assembled in the king's bedchamber, and Fawkes was brought before them. The agitation of the moment prevented a calm examination, but Fawkes replied with firmness to their questions and menaces. He gave his name as Johnson, but did not attempt to conceal his design, only refusing to tell the names of the other conspirators. When questioned by some of the Scottish courtiers, he told them that one of his objects was to blow them back into Scotland.¹ He was sent under guard to the Tower. Meantime, the rest of the conspirators were at last flying for their lives. Their confederates in Warwickshire dispersed as soon as they heard that the treasonable project had been frustrated. They thought of joining the Catholics of Wales and the border counties, who were known to be numerous and discontented, but found their hopes of a general rising disappointed. 'Not one man,' said Sir Everard Digby, 'came to take our part, though we had expected so many.' The Catholic gentry drove them from their doors, disowning an enterprise so injurious to the reputation of their faith, whilst the common people stood aloof in surprise and horror. A party of about fifty conspirators with their servants, endeavoured for a short time to defy the officers who were sent to apprehend them at Holbeach House on the borders of Staffordshire. Catesby, Percy, and two others, were mortally wounded, the rest were brought to London for trial. Although the prisoners were taken with arms in their hands, some of them at first denied participation in the Powder Plot, until convicted by the testimonies of those who had been induced to confess. The rank of the principal confederates preserved them from the application of torture, but Fawkes suffered on the rack. It was a great object with the government to ascertain how far the Catholic nobility and the priests had been concerned in the plot; but no threats could draw forth disclosures unfavourable to the priests, until Bates, Catesby's servant, probably when under torture, sanctioned the suspicion that the

¹ Jardine, ii. 78.

Jesuits Garnet and Greenway were aware of the design, and a proclamation was consequently issued for their apprehension. Early on January 27, eight prisoners—Sir Everard Digby, two brothers named Winter, Fawkes, and four others—were taken in a boat from the Tower to Westminster Hall for trial, where it was said that the king, queen, and prince were secret auditors of the proceedings.¹

Lord Salisbury, well aware that the only excuse for the exasperation of the Catholics was the refusal of toleration, instructed Sir Edward Coke, the Attorney-General, to explain that the severe laws passed by Elizabeth were occasioned by that rash bull of Pius V., which discharged her subjects from their allegiance; and that Catholic proposals for the invasion of England had been made to the King of Spain, and were declined by him before King James arrived in this kingdom. He declared that the king had exercised great lenity towards recusants until the discovery of the plot called 'The Priests' Treason.' Coke, with great injustice, compared the guilt of Raleigh, in what was called the 'Main Plot,' with the lately discovered wickedness. All the prisoners, excepting Sir Everard Digby, pleaded 'not guilty' to the charge, but the evidence obtained from the confessions of several others left no doubt of their guilt. The only excuse alleged for the horrible design was the oppression endured by the Catholics. Rookwood and Digby, who were men of rank and fortune, owned that they had been drawn into the plot by their friendship for Catesby.

The government gave all possible solemnity to the execution of the conspirators. Fawkes, weakened by torture and sickness, ascended the ladder with difficulty, said a few words expressing sorrow for his offence, and asked pardon of the king. Tresham died in the Tower. Two of the Jesuits contrived to escape to the continent, but Henry Garnet, their provincial superior, was apprehended in close concealment at Hendlip Hall, near Worcester, the residence of Mr. and Mrs. Abingdon. This mansion, erected by a zealous partisan of the Queen of Scots, was well adapted for a hiding-place; staircases were concealed in the walls, there were trap-doors, and places of retreat in the chimneys. Catholics under suspicion had indeed previously taken refuge there.

A report was brought to the sheriff that Garnet was concealed in this house, the intricate arrangements of which were made known; but although on the fourth day of the search, two

¹ Letter of Sir Edward Hoby, dated soon after the trial.—Jardine, ii. 115.

servants of the Jesuits were driven from their place of concealment by cold and hunger, it was not till the eighth day that an opening was made into the cell in which Garnet was secreted with another priest named Oldcorne, sometimes called Hall. They had been supplied with food through a reed which was inserted in a little hole of the chimney.

These Jesuits were conveyed to London on February 27, and after being examined by the Privy Council, were sent to the Tower, where a stratagem was used to discover their secrets. Having been put into adjoining cells, they were told that they could converse together if they opened a concealed door, and two persons were posted to overhear their conversation. Garnet's words proved him to have been aware of the plot, and consequently guilty of concealing it. Garnet had studied at Rome, and was reputed a man of great learning. He had resided for many years near London, disguising his real profession by various occupations, and it was well known that he had been engaged in treasonable correspondence with the King of Spain, just before the death of Elizabeth. To guard against imprisonment he had purchased a general pardon at the accession of James.¹ He was known to be intimate with Catesby, Tresham, and other conspirators, and with many of the Catholic nobility. It is said that James expressly forbade that torture should be applied to Garnet; but Oldcorne and the two servants were more harshly treated; and Owen, the superior's confidential servant, having been threatened with a repetition of torture, contrived to give himself a fatal wound. Garnet at first denied the words which he had used, but could not escape the force of the evidence extorted from Oldcorne.

The trial of Garnet took place at the Guildhall on March 28, under a special commission, over which the Earl of Salisbury and the Lord Mayor presided. The king was privately present, also the Lady Arabella Stuart with other ladies. After a trial which lasted from eight o'clock in the morning until eleven at night, Garnet was found guilty of high treason. The Catholic historian acknowledges that 'by seeking shelter under equivocation, he deprived himself of the protection which the truth might have given him, nor could he in such circumstances reasonably complain, if the king refused credit to his asseverations of innocence.'² James is said to have been inclined to lenient measures towards one of such high position in the Catholic Church, and a month was allowed to pass, during

¹ Jardine, ii. 128.

² Lingard, ix. 67.

which still more examinations took place, before the execution ensued on May 3. According to custom in cases of high treason, Garnet was drawn on a hurdle to St. Paul's churchyard, where a very lofty scaffold had been erected, that he might be seen by all the people. The Recorder of London and the Dean of Westminster still urging him to make further confession, Garnet acknowledged his guilt in not having revealed his knowledge of the plot, which he called 'that cruel and inhuman design,' words which were repeated by the recorder in a loud voice, and said that the Pope would never have given it his sanction. By the king's special order, his body was not divided until he had quite ceased to breathe.

A piece of the straw thrown into the basket with Garnet's remains was hoarded as a relic, and the absurd deception afterwards attempted by its means furnished an extraordinary proof of the popular credulity. The woman to whom this was given as a memento, put it into a small bottle, in which it was bent, and showed it in the bottle to a person who declared that he perceived some resemblance to a man's face. It was shown to others, who said the same, until it was thought worth while to add by art to the suggestion of fancy, and two faces appeared upon the straw, both surrounded with rays of glory.

Such was the scandal occasioned by this absurd exhibition, that the Privy Council desired the archbishop to detect and punish the impostors.

An artist, who made a drawing of the straw from recollection, stated that art had without doubt been resorted to. The contrivers were allowed to escape punishment, but other absurd stories in favour of the two Jesuits were circulated both in England and on the continent.¹ The Earl of Northumberland, who was related to Percy the conspirator, and had been destined to be protector of the realm, was sentenced in the Star Chamber to pay the impossible fine of £300,000, and was sent to the Tower, from which, after fourteen years' imprisonment, he was released on paying £11,000. Lord Mounteagle was rewarded for his share in the detection, and obtained pardon for Mr. Abingdon, of Hendlip Hall. 'We cannot wonder,' says Hallam, 'that a Parliament, so narrowly rescued from personal destruction, endeavoured to draw the cord still tighter round dangerous enemies.'²

When Catesby first suggested the scheme of the Gunpowder

¹ See a picture of 'The Miraculous Straw' in Jardine, ii. 345-50, with engravings of it. Oldcorne suffered death at Worcester.

² 'Constitutional History,' i. 405.

Plot, his friend Winter is said to have replied that such schemes usually miscarried, and that should this fail, the odium attaching to the Catholic body would overwhelm the conspirators with the reproaches even of their friends. The prediction was amply verified.

A statute was passed in May, 1606, by which additions were made to the penal code, forbidding Catholic recusants, under penalties, to show themselves at court, to dwell within ten miles of London, or to travel more than five miles from their homes without a special licence signed by four neighbouring magistrates. They were also forbidden to practise as surgeons, physicians, or lawyers, and to fill offices of trust. The penalty of £20 per month exacted for non-attendance at church was still in force; the king was allowed to take two-thirds of their lands in place of the fine, and householders who received visitors or kept servants of that persuasion were liable to be severely fined. Henry IV. of France, who had lately tranquillised his own country by the conciliatory 'Edict of Nantes,' warned James through his ambassador of the strong hold which religion possesses over the human mind; that it is a flame which burns the more fiercely when violently repulsed, for those who are persecuted glory in their suffering, and that much more may be done by kindness than by severity. James declared to the ambassador that he had often checked the eagerness of his ministers to resort to strong measures, but that the Catholics were so much infected with belief in the Papal authority, that he was compelled to leave the matter to the decision of Parliament.¹ A new oath of allegiance was now imposed upon the Catholics, requiring them to deny the temporal pretensions of the Pope, and to renounce in the most forcible terms the power which the Popes had assumed of deposing sovereigns. It became of the utmost importance to the English Catholics to decide on the lawfulness of taking this oath.

Blackwell, called the arch-priest, and most of the Catholic clergy, would have willingly taken it, but the Jesuits condemned it, and the question was carried to Rome for decision. Henry IV. again endeavoured to conciliate, admonishing the Pope that by fresh irritation, he might cause the extinction in England of the Catholic ritual. 'But the court of Rome, not yet receding an inch from her proudest claims, absolutely forbade the Catholics to abjure her deposing power.'²

It was with profound grief, premonitory of his own ruin, that Blackwell received the papal brief; 'hemmed in between

¹ Lingard, ix. 72, and note.

² Hallam, i. 407.

two sovereigns,' he informed his congregation that he considered it only as the private opinion of Paul V.¹ Shortly afterwards, three Catholic missionaries who refused to take the oath were sentenced to death; two were saved by the intercession of the French ambassador, but the other suffered as a traitor. Blackwell was also arrested, and in spite of his written declaration in favour of the oath, he was detained in prison until his death in 1613.

James, who was greatly delighted to show off his abilities in theological controversy, desisted for a time from hunting, his favourite amusement, and postponed the most urgent business to reply to Bellarmine's argument against the lawfulness of the oath.

The king's 'Apologie' was immediately translated into Latin and French, and copies were sent to all the principal European sovereigns. The King of Spain and the Archduke, however, declined to receive it. Answers also soon appeared, to which James again replied; and the Kings of France and Denmark recommended him to desist from a controversy which they thought unworthy of a crowned head.²

James had assumed in the second year of his reign the title of King of Great Britain, and he earnestly pressed upon Parliament a measure to perfect the union between England and Scotland; but in this he met with unexpected opposition. The Scots associated the idea of subjection with any proposal of annulling their ancient laws; and the old enmity of the English towards their northern brethren had been increased by the king's lavish liberality towards his Scottish followers. James relied much on his own powers of persuasion; he summoned both Houses to Whitehall, and tried to overcome their prejudices. But the royal eloquence was poured forth in vain; some members expressed themselves in Parliament with much acrimony against the Scots, and Sir Christopher Pigott was deprived of his place and sent to the Tower on account of the intemperance of his language.

But, although the king could not realise his wishes, peace began from this time to prevail on the Border, and the numerous statutes which had fostered hostility were entirely abrogated. A law which was passed in 1605 'for the final pacification of the Border,' forbade residents, excepting a few noblemen, to retain arms, or to possess horses worth more than fifty shillings.³ Still the difficulty of uniting those who had been so long

¹ Lingard, ix. 76.

² Hallam, 407; Lingard, 79.

³ See Sir Walter Scott's Introduction to 'Border Antiquities,' and Hallam, i. 310.

estranged, is proved by a letter written from England in 1607 by the Venetian ambassador. 'England and Scotland,' says he, 'are now united, but only in the person of the king, for the diversity and alienation of the people's minds is so great that it is believed that the power of the kingdom has rather decreased than augmented. Their hatred even goes so far that they seek each others' lives in a very extraordinary manner.'

Molino, the Venetian, was surprised at the freedom of discussion allowed in Parliament, and declared that James was more like the head of a republic than a monarch. It was by choice that the king left all business to his ministers and council, whilst he indulged in pleasure or pursued the field-sports in which he took delight. The ambassador at the same time observed in James the want of that affability by which Elizabeth had gained the hearts of her people. The queen, Anne of Denmark, took no part in public affairs, and was very fond of feasts and dancing. Intoxication was prevalent at the court, and even at times disgraced ladies of the highest rank.

The hopes of the country meanwhile were fixed on the young Prince Henry, who was a youth of good abilities. The king's remissness in state affairs and his excessive indulgence at the table were satirised at the theatre; and his ministers remonstrated, but in vain; for, jealous of any encroachment on his prerogative, James replied that he would not make himself a slave, and that his health, which was 'the health of all,' required exercise and relaxation.¹

The prodigality of the king and queen exceeded all former experience. A separate residence and a large retinue of servants were allowed to the Prince of Wales while still a child, and the king's large gifts to his Scottish adherents contributed to drain the treasury. When James first came to England he appears to have thought his riches inexhaustible; but in 1610, when, after the dissolution of Parliament, he tried to raise a loan, 'the merchants, grown bolder with the spirit of the times, refused him the accommodation.' James had then recourse to a way of raising money, new, it is believed, in England, though long practised in France—the sale of honours. He sold several peerages for large sums, and instituted an order of hereditary knights, called baronets, each of whom paid £1,000 for the patent.² 'For five thousand pounds,' says Mr. Forster, 'a man became a baron; for twenty thousand, an earl; and if Mr.

¹ See extract from the MS. of the Venetian ambassador in Von Raumer's 'Contributions to Modern History,' and Lingard, ix. 83.

² 'James had frequently before applied for loans of money, but the rich merchants

John Hampden of Buckinghamshire had not preferred a less perishable title, his mother would have given ten thousand pounds to make him a viscount.¹

The arbitrary inclosure of commons, a frequent cause of disturbance, was the pretext for an insurrection in Northamptonshire and the adjoining counties in 1607. Lords of manors, by encroaching on common land, had diminished the subsistence of the poor, and the council of state had neglected their remonstrances. Lawless assemblages of men and women suddenly collected, the walls of parks were demolished and fences levelled, and, as in Ket's rebellion, fifty-eight years earlier, the rioters appeared to be under the direction of leaders who established a kind of order among them, forbidding acts of personal violence or even the use of profane language.

A royal proclamation, calling upon the insurgents to disperse, was at first without effect; they declared that the inclosures had been illegal, and that they were only restoring the country to its former state. The noblemen who held land in the disturbed districts at length collected bodies of horse, and by traversing the country and attacking the insurgents, put down the insurrection.

The king recommended mercy, as the people had reason to complain of the rapacity of their superiors, but the leaders of the rising, and those who offered the most obstinate resistance, suffered death.²

However needful might now be a resort to the powers of the executive, Parliament had reason to apprehend evil consequences from the doctrine of the king's divine right to absolute power, which was maintained in convocation by the High Church party, and advocated by all who were bidding for the royal favour.

The publication of a law dictionary, called 'The Interpreter,' by a Dr. Cowell, dedicated to Archbishop Bancroft, not, as was believed, without the royal approval, brought these opinions under the notice of Parliament. Under the heads of 'King,' 'Subsidy,' 'Parliament,' &c., principles were set forth so contrary to general liberty, that if put in practice they would have made the King of England an absolute monarch.³ The were averse to lending without either interest or security, and the House of Commons requested that such demands should not be enforced, which drew forth angry expressions from the king.—Hallam, i. 338.

¹ Forster's 'Historical Essays,' i. 237.

² Lingard, ix. 85-6.

³ James had inculcated similar doctrines in his treatise 'On the True Law of Free Monarchies,' which had been printed some years before in Scotland.—Hallam, i. 299.

House of Commons, justly incensed at opinions which threatened to extinguish all free discussion, solicited and obtained a conference with the Lords ; upon which James discovered that the book must be sacrificed, and it was suppressed by proclamation, for which the Commons returned thanks with great joy. Cowell underwent a short imprisonment, and the king declared that he should look upon those who defended the book as his enemies.¹

The cruelty of Queen Elizabeth towards the Lady Catherine Grey after her marriage had been only palliated by the difficulty in which the country might have been involved from an undetermined succession, and by the fact, then more recent, that her sister, the Lady Jane, had been actually declared queen. James, whose pretensions had been only disputed by a few conspirators, and who had sons to succeed him, had less excuse for his conduct to the Lady Arabella, who had never engaged in the machinations of those who covered their schemes with her name. It was this lady's unhappy fate to form an attachment to Mr. William Seymour, grandson of that Earl of Hertford who married the Lady Catherine Grey. On the discovery of their private marriage, alarm was immediately felt at this union of two persons who might possibly aspire to the crown ; they were summoned before the Privy Council and separately imprisoned, Lady Arabella in a private house at Lambeth, Mr. Seymour in the Tower. They both enjoyed some degree of freedom for exercise ; but, when informed that they were carrying on a correspondence, James resolved on stricter measures, and placed Arabella under charge of the Bishop of Durham. In weak health and great dejection, Lady Arabella began the journey, but was detained by indisposition at Highgate. There she remained for several weeks, and at length, in the desperate hope to avoid the northern banishment and rejoin her husband, she contrived to escape on horseback in man's attire, and reached a ship lying off Leigh. Mr. Seymour not arriving at the appointed time, Lady Arabella sailed without him ; he afterwards embarked and arrived safely in Flanders. The court was in great alarm at the discovery of Arabella's flight ; her vessel was pursued and overtaken in Calais Roads, and the unhappy lady was brought back and closely imprisoned in the Tower, where, after four years of confinement, which at times affected her reason, she died. Seymour was afterwards allowed to return to England ; he distinguished himself by his loyalty during three successive reigns, in reward for which

¹ Hallam, i. 324 ; Lingard, ix. 93-4.

he was made Marquis of Hertford by Charles I. and Duke of Somerset by Charles II.¹

The contest of forty years waged by Spain against 'the United Provinces,' which defied her tyranny, had been at length ended. The support of France and England, uncertain as the assistance given by this country had been, had aided the Hollanders in their long struggle with their formidable antagonist, and both Henry IV. and James sent envoys to assist at the negotiations which, in 1609, produced a truce destined to last for twelve years.²

The Reformed Church of Holland was at this time agitated by the disputes of Calvinists and Arminians. With these England had no concern; but although James had felt no sympathy with the Netherlands in their struggle for liberty, he was always eager to come forward as a Protestant Pope. One day, when the king was engaged in hunting, a Latin work by Vorstius, who had lately succeeded to the chair of divinity in Leyden, was shown him. James willingly left his amusement to study the work of the Arminian professor, and was so greatly shocked with the heresies which he discovered, that, not content with forbidding its dissemination in England, he sent threatening messages to the States of Holland requiring the expulsion of the author. The first feeling of the Dutch was to resent this interference in their domestic affairs, but James was resolute; he wrote with his own hand that no heretic had ever deserved the stake more than Vorstius, and he published a short work in French in opposition to his opinions. Prince Maurice, who had the command of the army in Holland, also took the Calvinistic side. The professor was at length expelled from the university in which he held an honoured place, and never regained his position.³ James was so well satisfied with the conduct of Prince Maurice, as to confer upon him the order of the Garter, vacant through the tragical death of Henry IV. of France.⁴

It could not be expected that a sovereign who thus presumed to interfere respecting a subject of a neighbouring nation, should favour the rights of conscience at home, and James was the last king of England under whom the fires of Smithfield were lighted.

¹ See Disraeli's 'Curiosities of Literature,' and Hallam, i. 350.

² 'Mankind,' says Motley, 'were amazed at an event hitherto unknown in history. When before had a sovereign acknowledged the independence of his rebellious subjects, and signed a treaty with them as equal?'—'History of the United Netherlands,' iv. 522.

³ Miss Aikin's 'James I.,' i. 384; Lingard, ix. 128; Grattan's 'History of the Netherlands.'

⁴ Henry IV. was murdered by an assassin named Ravallac in May, 1610.

With the aid of several bishops he examined Bartholomew Legate, who had been detected in the dissemination of Arian doctrines; Legate was condemned to the flames, and another heretic, named Wightman, also suffered at Norwich in March, 1612. But society was becoming more humane, and when James was informed that the spectators murmured at these horrors, he prudently withdrew a third victim, consigning him to a dungeon for life.¹

In May, 1612, death deprived the king of the services of his able minister, Cecil Earl of Salisbury, son of Lord Burleigh, who, although he had made personal enemies by the acrimony with which he pursued both Essex and Raleigh, appears to have exercised a beneficial influence in foreign affairs, and to have given careful encouragement to English manufactures. After the earl's death, 'state affairs,' says Hallam, 'were far worse conducted both at home and abroad.'² The loss of that able minister, who had appeared to the Venetian ambassador the actual ruler of England, opened the door to numerous candidates for favour, who formed hostile parties. Carr, Lord Rochester, a Scotsman, long the king's favourite, and now created Earl of Somerset, took the nominal lead in affairs, the business of which he was not personally competent to transact.

Sir Walter Raleigh had, before his arrest, taken measures to convey his estate at Sherborne to his eldest son, which the king had allowed, and the rest of his property had been assigned for the benefit of his family; but a slight flaw having been discovered in the conveyance, James conferred Sherborne upon his rapacious favourite, and reserved only £8,000 as a compensation to Raleigh's family. It is said that Lady Raleigh entreated the king in vain on her knees to spare this estate, James making answer, 'I mun have the land; I mun have it for Carr.' This estate was worth £5,000 per annum.³ Soon after the death of Cecil, Frederick, Count Palatine of the Rhine, became a suitor for the hand of the young Princess Elizabeth. James was continually bent on Spanish alliances, and would have preferred to give his daughter to the King of Spain; but the Protestant faith of the count made him acceptable to the English people, and his suit was heartily promoted by the Prince of Wales. The preparations for the marriage were begun,

¹ Lingard, ix. 159. King, Bishop of London, was the last who put in force the statute for the burning of heretics.—See Dr. Milman's 'St. Paul's,' p. 321.

² 'Constitutional History,' i. 333.

³ Hallam, i. 354, note, and 'Edinburgh Review' of April, 1840. Hallam says that James gave Raleigh £12,000 for the estate, which was, however, worth £5,000 per annum.

when Prince Henry, then eighteen years of age, fell ill of typhus fever, for which the court physician insisted on continually bleeding him; he died a fortnight after the attack, to the great regret of the nation. The king showed but little regret for the loss of a son whose high spirit contrasted greatly with his own character, and whose differences with his father had been sufficiently obvious. Raleigh had employed part of his prison hours in writing for the prince's benefit, 'A Discourse on the Art of War at Sea,' which was unfinished at the prince's death. A cordial friendship existed between them, and Henry is said to have declared that surely no king but his father 'would keep such a bird in a cage.' The mourning for the prince's death was not allowed long to delay the court festivities, and Elizabeth's marriage was celebrated with unusual splendour.¹ The princess was only in her sixteenth year, gay and thoughtless, little dreaming of the singular trials which awaited her.

Had Elizabeth married a Catholic, her name might have been unnoticed; but that Protestantism which partly caused the difficulties of her life, in course of years raised her grandson, George of Hanover, to the throne of England.

Carr, Earl of Somerset, employed Sir Thomas Overbury in transacting public business, and Overbury was in consequence courted as a man of influence. Suddenly he was deprived of that favour and committed to the Tower. The cause of his sudden downfall was said to be that he had opposed the projected marriage of Lord Somerset with Lady Frances, the youthful daughter of Lord Suffolk, who had been married to the Earl of Essex when they were both children. Lady Frances now desired to obtain a divorce in order to marry Somerset. The king indecorously interfered in the judicial proceedings, influenced, it was said, by the gift of £25,000 from his favourite minister, and the judges decided in favour of the divorce; but on disclosure of the affair, it was found that Overbury had died after six months' confinement in the Tower, and it was strongly suspected that he died of poison.² In December the king and many of the principal nobility honoured the marriage of Lord Somerset with their presence, and in spite of the evil reports, a long continuance of rejoicings took place in London. The general suspicion concerning Overbury's death might possibly have subsided, had not James again incurred popular indignation by his partiality for a new favourite, the young George Villiers, who had lately purchased the situation of royal cup-bearer. The party in opposition to Lord Somerset now

¹ On St. Valentine's day, 1613.

² Lingard, ix. 109.

strongly urged the need of an inquiry into the circumstances of Overbury's death. Three hundred examinations are said to have taken place before Sir Edward Coke brought the king a report, ascribing the ruin of Overbury to a plan laid by Lady Frances and the Earl of Northampton. Coke accused the Lady Frances of having resorted to a Mrs. Turner, a pretended sorceress, in order to obtain the dissolution of her first marriage and her union with Somerset.¹ It was asserted that with the aid of this woman, Lady Frances procured poison, which she entrusted to Weston, the warder in the Tower, to be administered to Overbury. Upon this evidence, Weston, Turner, Franklin, the apothecary who sold the poison, and Elwes, the lieutenant of the Tower, were all tried, found guilty and executed. The trials of Lord and Lady Somerset were deferred. Lady Somerset was induced to confess the instigation of the murder, was brought separately before the House of Lords, and pleaded guilty. Bacon, the Attorney-General, explained to the peers the evidence collected against her, and she was condemned to death. Somerset, who was afterwards subjected to a long trial, was likewise condemned. But the king was averse to inflict the severest punishment on one who had so long enjoyed his especial favour and whose marriage he had so lately honoured; it has been supposed also by some historians that James dreaded the disclosure of some secrets which it was in Somerset's power to divulge.

Both Lord and Lady Somerset were remanded to the Tower; they were liberated in the year 1621, and retired to a country seat, supported by an ample allowance from their forfeited estate, but their remaining years are said to have been embittered by their mutual hatred and by the contempt of the world. In the last year of the reign Somerset received a full pardon from the king, with some hopes of a restoration to favour.²

With regard to the advocates of opinions to which he was opposed, James was tyrannically severe, and in some cases cruel. Hallam has called the prosecution of a Puritan minister named Peacham, 'perhaps the worst and most tyrannical act of the reign.' In the year 1615, some spy or treacherous servant found in this elderly minister's study a sermon which had neither been preached nor published, but which con-

¹ Lingard, ix. 115.

² Aikin, ii. 22; Hallam, i. 352, and notes. 'A mystery,' says Hallam, 'hangs over the scandalous tale of Overbury's murder,' which cannot be considered sufficiently accounted for by Lady Somerset's revenge. Somerset is said to have uttered threats against the king.—Lingard, ix. 118.

tained severe remarks upon the king's prodigality, and such censure of the government as, if published, would have been a seditious libel. To extract, if possible, some confession of his accomplices or design, Peacham was put on the rack and examined during and after torture, again and again. To Bacon's disgrace, he was the examiner. Peacham was brought to trial and found guilty. He died in prison a few months afterwards.

Some of the judges having objected to founding a charge of treason on the discovery of an *unpublished* sermon, James directed Bacon to confer with them on the subject privately, upon which Coke, who had lately been created chief justice, remonstrated that it was illegal for the king to use private influence. Coke was in this case induced to yield, but he soon incurred the royal displeasure by the spirit with which he defended the law against the king's attempts to overrule it, and was consequently dismissed his office. Although Sir Edward C  ke was rightly blamed for rudeness and cruelty in the prosecution of prisoners, he thus set an example of honourable independence, and he afterwards became a strenuous upholder of constitutional liberty in Parliament.¹

James frequently attempted to interfere with the liberty of his subjects by issuing proclamations. In this manner he forbade the erection of new houses within two miles of London, unless they were built on old foundations, and commanded the country gentlemen to leave the metropolis for their homes, where they should exercise hospitality. A proclamation was also issued prohibiting the making of wheat into starch.

In the year 1610 the Commons remonstrated against this practice; and the judges agreed that 'the king had no prerogative but what the law of the land allowed him;' that he could not by proclamation, unsupported by Parliament, 'create an offence.'² The king's despotic aims were nourishing the spirit and strength of the House of Commons. Confident in its right, as laid down in ancient records, to refuse the levy of customs at the outports, it passed a unanimous vote against such impositions.³ James dissolved this Parliament after only a two months' session, and punished several of the members for freedom of speech by ordering their arrest, and keeping them

¹ See Hallam, i. 342-9. Lord Macaulay's Essay on Bacon, vol. ii. 175. After he became a judge he was commonly called Lord Coke.

² The judges only repeated an assertion made 'in the midst of the Tudor period, Mary's reign, that no proclamation can make a new law, but can only confirm an ancient one.'—Hallam, i. 336-337, note.

³ A.D. 1614.

for a short time in custody. During the next six years the king went on without a Parliament, supplying his exchequer in great measure by the considerable sums brought by fines. A new 'benevolence' was set on foot by the nobility and court favourites, and the magistrates were directed to call upon persons able to contribute. Mr. Oliver St. John, of Wiltshire, forestalling Hampden's intrepidity, and perhaps encouraged by Coke's adverse opinion, wrote a letter to the mayor of Marlborough explaining his reasons for refusing to pay, and concluding with some blunt observations respecting the king. This letter having come under the notice of the Star Chamber, St. John was sentenced to pay a fine of £5,000, and to be imprisoned during the royal pleasure.

The king wrestled hard to defend his prerogative, and for some time not without success. The question was raised in the Court of King's Bench, whether a bishop could legally hold an additional living, and whether the king possessed the power of making such a grant. James, who was at Newmarket, wrote to Lord Coke, desiring the proceedings to be delayed till his return. Coke requested that similar letters should be sent to the other judges, who all agreed in signing a reply declaring his Majesty's interference to be contrary to law. James, in great indignation, wrote to command them to forbear from interposing further in the cause, and, upon his return to London, the twelve judges appeared in the council chamber as culprits, and received a sharp rebuke from the king. Falling on their knees, they acknowledged that they had erred in the form of their letter, and all of them, excepting the chief justice, promised, according to the prescribed terms, that in future they would make what delay the king might require, as was their duty. Coke alone replied, that when the case should arise he would do his duty as a judge. James dismissed them with directions that in future they would keep the limits of their courts, and not suffer his prerogative to be wounded.¹

A favourite on whom he could implicitly rely was to James an essential of life. After the disgrace of Somerset, that place was filled by Villiers, who was raised by successive steps to be Marquis of Buckingham. From him crowds of applicants—peers, prelates, and commoners, purchased favours and offices by large presents.²

For thirteen years Sir Walter Raleigh had continued a prisoner in the Tower, and although one of the most eager and enterprising of men, he pursued his studies whilst in confinement

¹ Hallam, i. 346-348.

² Lingard, ix. 161.

with the greatest patience and assiduity. Being allowed to convert 'a little hen-house in the Tower garden into a still-house,' he occupied himself for a time entirely in chemistry, and afterwards in his great work 'The History of the World,' in which he showed indefatigable industry, and proved himself, in the opinion of competent judges, one of the best writers of the age.

In the Tower he was not without the society of ingenious men. The eccentric Earl of Northumberland endured confinement there for fifteen years, owing to his relationship to the conspirator Percy, keeping an open table for the learned men who were allowed to visit him. The attention of enterprising minds had for some time been directed to that new world beyond the Atlantic, penetrated but in part, concerning which the most extravagant expectations had been formed. To the vain attempt to make gold in the chemist's crucible had succeeded the hope of finding it in profusion in the supposed golden region called 'El Dorado.' Raleigh was deeply read in the histories of the Spanish discoveries, and his mind was inflamed with hopes of still greater success. The failure of his half-brother, Sir Humphrey Gilbert, who had received a commission from Elizabeth and perished in a storm, had not abated Raleigh's courage. In 1595 he had sailed to South America, and had ascended the Orinoco in a boat for about sixty leagues, but was compelled to return by the danger of inundations.

The popular conceptions of the wealth of these unknown regions outran all reasonable belief, and Raleigh has been accused of endeavouring to impose on his countrymen by descriptions of the fabled riches of Manoa, where the houses were roofed with gold. But although he might deceive others, he appears to have been himself deceived, and to have confidently believed that in the vast region lying between the Orinoco and the Amazon were rocks of glittering gold. Credible explorers, indeed, have since discovered mica, which might be mistaken for the most precious metal. In his former disastrous expedition Raleigh had ascertained the existence of a gold mine, and he addressed a petition to the queen, who was more favourably disposed to him than James, that he might be allowed his liberty in order to pursue discoveries on which he had set his heart.¹ He

¹ The queen and her brother, the King of Denmark, and the Prince of Wales had all applied in vain to James for Raleigh's liberation. Humboldt, in his 'Personal Narrative,' describes rocks of mica slate and talc reflecting the rays of an ardent sun. The Spaniards more than a century afterwards subjected pieces of rock to chemical proof in order to discover gold, but in vain.

was ready to risk his life and to embark his fortune on the venture, and offered that the king should share the profits. This petition was supported by a gift of fifteen hundred pounds to the uncles of the new favourite, Buckingham. At last, in March, 1615, Raleigh's prison doors were opened; he was free, though not pardoned. James was fearful that his adventurous subject might incur the enmity of Spain by intermeddling with her possessions, and, in his own words which were afterwards published, withheld a pardon, 'in order the better to hold him in subjection.' Gondomar, the Spanish ambassador, was carefully on the watch that the projected expedition should not infringe on the rights of Spain. The commission granted to Raleigh empowered him to go to any part of America still unappropriated, but he was bound to abstain from all hostile inroads on any Spanish settlement. Notwithstanding all difficulties and discouragements, the contemplated prizes were so tempting, the confidence in Raleigh's knowledge and enterprising spirit was so great, that he had many eager associates, and in a few months collected a fleet of thirteen vessels, carrying a proportionate number of cannon. Raleigh's own ship, 'The Destiny,' which was built under his express orders, attracted the attention of all the foreign ambassadors. Gondomar forwarded a copy of the plan of the expedition to his brother, who was the governor of the small Spanish settlement of St. Thomas.

It was at the end of March, 1617, that the expedition left the English shores. It started with disaster; the commanders were driven by storms into Cork harbour, and when, in November, they at length reached the coast of Guiana, two of the ships were missing, many of the crews ill, and Raleigh himself was too unwell to head the expedition up the Orinoco. Compelled to remain at anchor, he sent a party, including his own eldest son and nephew, under the command of the experienced Captain Keymis, to take possession of the expected mine. After a month spent in ascending the river they disembarked near St. Thomas, where they were attacked by the Spaniards, and a conflict took place in which young Raleigh and the Spanish governor were both killed, and the English destroyed the town by fire. Keymis spent twenty more days in search of the supposed mine, continually fired upon by the Spaniards in the woods. He then gave it up and brought back his reduced forces to Trinidad, near which his unfortunate commander was anxiously awaiting the result. It is easy to conceive that this utter failure plunged Raleigh into the depths of misery. His son had

fallen, his own fortune was ruined, and an unpardonable outrage had been committed on the colony of that power which he had been commanded carefully to respect. The unfortunate Keymis, in despair at his failure and stung by Raleigh's reproaches, stabbed himself. Raleigh, still hoping to renew the enterprise, sailed to Newfoundland to refit, but was baffled by the dispersion of his ships and the mutiny of his crew. So great was the danger attending his return to England under these circumstances, that historians have been puzzled to account for his venturing again 'to put his neck under the king's girdle,' as he is reported afterwards to have expressed it. In a letter which he wrote to his wife, he said that his 'brains were broken,' and that, like Sir Francis Drake and John Hawkins, he should die broken-hearted after this failure, were it not for hersake. But in fact he was not without reasonable ground for trust that the king, who so lately had given him a commission including power to exercise martial law, would not consider the old conviction of treason still sustainable against him.¹

The natives of the South American coast, with whom alone he held intercourse on this disastrous voyage, were fondly attached to him, and he might have lived, so he wrote to his wife, as 'a king amongst them.' But there he would not tarry. Broken-hearted, and nearly despairing, he arrived at Plymouth at the beginning of July, 1618, and was immediately put under arrest by Sir Lewis Stukeley, vice-admiral of Devon. The news of the destruction of St. Thomas, and of the disastrous conclusion, had reached England before Raleigh's return; and the Spanish ambassador had appeared before James, repeating three times the word '*pirates*,' and demanding satisfaction for the injury.

James, who was especially desirous to cultivate the friendship of Spain, and to secure the marriage of his son Charles to the Infanta, immediately desired Buckingham to inform the King of Spain of the arrest of the chief offender, and of the seizure of his property, promising to send Raleigh to Spain for judgment, unless the king should prefer the punishment to take place in England.

Raleigh used several stratagems in his endeavours to escape the doom which now awaited him. To avoid immediate confinement he gave himself the appearance of suffering from an eruptive fever, and tried to escape to France, but was betrayed by the French servant in whom he confided.² At last, on

¹ Hallam, i. 354.

² Jardine's 'Criminal Trials,' i. 485.

August 10, the Tower once again opened to receive that unfortunate but gifted man, whom his friend, the poet Spenser, had long before called 'the Shepherd of the Ocean.'

Fifteen years had now passed since Sir Walter Raleigh's trial and conviction at Winchester, a conviction so manifestly unjust that it could not be followed by his execution. Whilst awaiting the reply from Spain he was often examined by the lord chancellor and other members of the Privy Council, and he was put under the strict charge of Sir Thomas Wilson, appointed lieutenant of the Tower with this view, who was directed to draw from him any information respecting his communications with France, or his late expedition, which might support a criminal charge. Lady Raleigh and her son were excluded from the prison, but she was encouraged to write to him freely, all the notes sent by her or Raleigh being transmitted to the king and council before they were delivered. It is a bad sign that Sir Thomas, supposed to be a man of honour, could stoop to the base office of a spy, never leaving his prisoner from the time when he unlocked his room in the morning until night. He showed his inclination in a letter to the king, saying that he had hoped to work out more than he had yet done, and adding, 'if not, I know no other means but a rack or halter.'¹

The King of Spain declared that the punishment ought to be inflicted in England, where Raleigh received the commission of which he had broken the conditions. James then consulted the judges, who decided that he could not be brought to trial again, being already under condemnation, but that in view of his having been instrumental in the destruction of the town of St. Thomas, the king might justly cause him to be executed on the former sentence. On October 28, Raleigh was placed at the bar of the King's Bench, and, having in vain pleaded that his commission was equivalent to a pardon for former offences, was dismissed for execution.

As soon as he lost all hope of preserving his life, Raleigh was sustained by that fortitude which he had already shown in the most trying scenes. Bred in the school of those brave adventurers of Elizabeth's reign, who thought all pillage allowable on the seas, he had trusted that even the piracy against which he had been warned would be excused if accompanied by brilliant success. Although the burning of St. Thomas was not his own act, it appears that he knew that an incursion would be made on Spanish property, and had thought of attacking

¹ Jardine, i. 491.

the Mexican fleet. The general feeling in England was one of sympathy for him, and of strong indignation against the king who thus sacrificed his illustrious subject to gratify the resentment of Spain, England's ancient enemy. A despatch on this occasion to the British ambassador in Spain proves that James even exulted in the value of the life which he destroyed: 'Let them know,' says this despatch, 'how able a man Sir Walter Raleigh was to have done his Majesty service; yet, to give them content, he hath not spared him, when by preserving him he might have given great satisfaction to his subjects, and had at his command as useful a man as served any prince in Christendom.'¹

The execution took place on October 29. Raleigh refuted several charges concerning his former conduct, but did not allude to those for which he suffered death. Having taken leave of the lords who were present, he laid his head on the block and gave the signal; but the executioner was so slow in giving the fatal blow that he exclaimed, 'Strike, man!' At the second blow his head was severed from his body. Raleigh was in his sixty-sixth year at the time of his death.

James felt the disapprobation of his subjects so strongly that, with the assistance of Lord Bacon, he composed a vindication, yet without in any way modifying the popular feeling. The Spaniards have called Raleigh a corsair; but, 'famous in arts and arms, politics, science, literature,' his name was perpetuated amongst those who have contributed to England's glory, and his tragic fate was the king's 'undying shame.'² One son, named Carew, survived, who at the time of the execution was a child. He was presented at court when he reached manhood, but James took a dislike to one who looked, as he said, 'like his father's ghost;' and Carew Raleigh was advised to travel till the close of the reign.

In the desire to promote a closer union between England and Scotland, James had been sanguine that the independent Puritans of his native country would be induced to conform to the English Church; but in this hope he was continually disappointed. In 1606 an Act was passed by the Scottish Parliament restoring episcopacy; and six years afterwards it was enacted that the general assemblies appointing ministers of the Gospel should be nominated by the king. Every clergyman was to take an oath both acknowledging the royal supremacy and promising obedience to the bishops; but many had resisted

¹ See 'Edinburgh Review,' cited from Rushworth's 'Hist. Coll.' vol. i.

² See Motley's 'History of the Netherlands,' iii. 381.

these changes and been punished in consequence ; wherefore, as an inducement to the leading party to yield their republican form of church government, the lord treasurer, the Earl of Dunbar, had allowed a severe persecution of Roman Catholic recusants.

Although, when James left Scotland in 1603, he promised frequently to revisit it, fourteen years elapsed before he carried out this intention, for which delay the want of money has been assigned as a reason. At length, in 1617, the needful funds were advanced, and the king opened the Scottish Parliament, but with a speech part of which more resembled that of an angry schoolmaster than of a king delighted to revisit his native dominions. He told the Scots that he had ‘nothing more at heart than to reduce their barbarity to the sweet civility of their neighbours ; if they would be as docile to learn the goodness of the English as they had been to limp after their ill,’ he should be well pleased. He afterwards met an assembly of clergy at St. Andrew’s, where their remonstrating ministers were condemned, one to perpetual exile, the others to imprisonment, and he directed the observance of the festivals of Christmas, Easter, and Whitsuntide, to which Scottish Protestants had hitherto objected as the usage of the Church of Rome. The clergy dared not in the king’s presence give utterance to their disgust, but when he left Scotland their aversion to what they termed the relics of Popery, devoid of all scriptural authority, became irrepressible. James was surprised and offended, and ordered these articles of ritual to be enforced by proclamation.

Three years afterwards he induced the Scottish Parliament to establish a church discipline still more repugnant to the feelings of the people, but the history of his mother and grandmother had shown him the stern temper of the Scottish religionists, and he feared to awaken their rebellious spirit by insisting on further alterations.¹

Reference is often made in the history of this reign to the Court of Star Chamber, that ‘paramount court’ over which the Lord Chancellor presided, which ‘was the great weapon of executive power under Elizabeth and James.’ This court was held competent to adjudge any punishment short of death, and by the infliction of penalties of large amount the Government sought to supply ‘the craving emptiness of the exchequer.’ Regardless of the provision of the Great Charter that no man should be taxed to the full extent of his property, ruinous fines

¹ Lingard, ix. 138.

were imposed, and the encroaching domination of this court under the Stuarts threatened to absorb all other jurisdictions. Those offences which could be included under 'contempt of the king's authority,' viz. riots, fraud, conspiracy, forgery, libels, fell under the cognisance of the Star Chamber.¹

The High Commission Court was another tribunal which is said to have been first instituted in consequence of the powers which Queen Mary confided to certain bishops to hunt out heretics and bring them to punishment.² Instituted by the Roman Catholic queen, it was eagerly employed by James to strengthen his despotic authority. Two Puritans, who had been committed to prison by the High Commission Court, for refusing the oath tendered them, employed Mr. Fuller, of Gray's Inn, to move for their liberation, which he did on the ground that the High Commissioners had no legal power to commit any subject to prison. But this pleading was considered a heinous offence, Fuller was himself committed and remained in gaol until his death, the archbishop constantly opposing his discharge. Whitelock, who afterwards became a judge, was summoned before the Star Chamber on the charge that he had privately asserted that a certain commission issued by the crown was illegal, but he was discharged on a humble submission. A more distinguished person succumbed under 'a still more preposterous accusation.'³ Selden, the learned lawyer, in his 'History of Tithes,' indirectly weakened the claim made by the clergy to divine right in enforcing that payment, and when summoned before the High Commission Court was induced by fear to apologise. The zealots of England would not be out of keeping with their age, and Selden's submission supplied no uneven counterpart to that of Galileo. 'Selden,' says Hallam, 'like the great Florentine astronomer, bent to the rod of power, and made rather too submissive an apology.'⁴

In 1617, the Earl of Suffolk, the Lord Treasurer, and his wife, were brought before the Star Chamber on an accusation of embezzlement, and were sentenced to pay a fine of £30,000, which the king was afterwards prevailed upon to reduce. On this occasion, and on the trial of Sir Thomas and Lady Lake,

¹ Hallam's 'Constitutional History,' i. 448, 450, 452, 453, note. It is not easy to ascertain with exactness the definition of those constituting the Court of the Star Chamber. Hudson, who wrote concerning it about the end of this reign, thought that all peers had the right to be present, yet that the king could exclude any one at his pleasure. According to Plowden's 'Commentaries,' the Chancellor, Treasurer, and Privy Seal alone were judges, the rest assistants only.

² Ibid. 201.

³ Hallam.

⁴ Hallam, i. 350.

whom their own connexions accused of defamation, James was gratified by taking his seat among the judges, which Coke is said to have previously denied him.

Pending the treaty of marriage between the Prince of Wales and the Spanish Infanta, the execution of the penal laws against the Catholics had been remitted. Events were taking place on the Continent, nearly concerning the royal family, which excited warm interest among English Protestants.

The people of Bohemia, who were chiefly Protestant, had long unwillingly borne their subjection to Austria. In May, 1618, they rose in rebellion, refused to submit to Ferdinand, the new emperor, and offered their crown to Frederick, the Elector Palatine, the son-in-law of King James. Dazzled by the offer, the Elector accepted the perilous post, without consulting either his father-in-law or his uncle, the Prince of Orange, and was crowned King of Bohemia in November, 1619. The news excited various feelings in England. Archbishop Abbot, who had warmly advocated the marriage of the princess, now urged the king to uphold his son-in-law, arguing that the crown of Bohemia, being properly independent, might rightly be conferred on Frederick, the descendant of a Protestant family.

James was greatly embarrassed ; he looked upon the kingdom of Bohemia as belonging to Austria, objected on principle to giving encouragement to rebels, and feared by so doing to offend the King of Spain and to frustrate his son's intended marriage. These feelings led him to a compromise. He refused to admit the envoy of the new King of Bohemia or to recognise his title, but he sent an army of four thousand volunteers, commanded by the Earls of Essex and Oxford, to protect the hereditary dominions of his son-in-law. An open war with Austria would have been popular in England.

The chivalrous spirit of the young nobility was roused on behalf of their young princess exposed to so much peril; there was sympathy also for the Protestants. But the aid of the English volunteers, added to that of German allies, proved quite insufficient to withstand the imperial forces. Frederick's army was totally routed at Prague, on November 8, 1620, and Bohemia lay at the conqueror's mercy. James endeavoured in vain to obtain the restitution of the Palatinate for his son-in-law ; aided by popular feeling, he recruited his finances by a benevolence, and gave a reluctant sanction to some ill-arranged attempts in Frederick's favour.¹

‘ After six years of silence the voice of the nation was again

¹ Sandford's ‘ Studies and Illustrations,’ p. 62.

to be heard.’¹ Lord Bacon, writing officially to Buckingham, warned that minister that ‘the prognostics were not so good as he expected,’ owing to the late occurrences abroad and general discontent at home. To stifle that expression of discontent, a proclamation was issued, prohibiting all persons, high or low, from speaking of state affairs, or discussing the conduct of the king’s allies.

But the king and his ministers could little divine the strength of purpose which this memorable Parliament would display. The names of several of the members have become historic. Hampden first entered the House of Commons this year, where he met Pym, Selden, Camden, Coke, and Fleetwood. Bacon, who had been raised in 1617 to be Lord Keeper, in 1620 received the higher title of Lord Chancellor, and, a few days before Parliament met, the further distinction of Viscount St. Alban’s. After showing their Protestant zeal by objecting to the favours lately shown to the Catholics, the Commons complained of the arrest of some of the members at the close of the last Parliament, whereby their privileges had been invaded. They appointed a committee to inquire into monopolies and bribery, and Sir Giles Mompesson and Sir Francis Mitchell, who had held a patent for the exclusive manufacture of gold and silver lace, were found to have made use of much copper instead of gold. This counterfeit lace had been sold at an exorbitant price, and any persons who attempted competition by bringing forward a better article had been punished by fine and imprisonment. These fraudulent dealers were encouraged and emboldened by finding a secret partner in Sir Edward Villiers, half-brother of the Marquis of Buckingham.² The guilt was, however, so strongly proved that Buckingham dared not attempt to screen his relation. Villiers fled; Mompesson and Mitchell were impeached and degraded, and many minor offenders were overthrown by the storm of popular indignation.

A more important case followed. On March 15, Sir Robert Philips, the chairman of the committee, reported to the House that information had been brought of a case of bribery ‘which touched the honour of so great a man, of one so endowed with all parts both of nature and art, as that he would say no more of him, not being able to say enough.’ The lord chancellor, still known throughout the world by the name which his philosophical works have rendered so illustrious, Lord Bacon, was accused of having received bribes from suitors in his court. The king expressed his deep regret at these charges. The

¹ ‘Macaulay’s ‘Essay on Bacon.’

² Aikin, ii. 207.

Commons held a conference with the Lords, and a committee of the Upper House was appointed to collect evidence. Parliament was prorogued for three weeks and the business was then resumed. Bacon meanwhile was prostrate with shame and despair.

He appealed in moving terms to the king: 'I hope I shall not be found to have the troubled fountain of a corrupt heart, in a depraved habit of taking rewards to pervert justice; howsoever I may be frail, and partake of the abuses of the times.'¹ He attempted to excite the king's fears, urging that 'those who now strike at the chancellor will soon strike at the crown.' James might desire to save him without 'having sufficient influence over the Parliament to procure an acquittal,' says Lord Macaulay, 'in so clear a case of guilt.' Bacon, in a letter addressed to the peers which was delivered by the Prince of Wales, acknowledged but endeavoured to palliate his guilt. His judges were not satisfied with this, they gave him a copy of the charges, and required a more particular confession; he replied by admitting the truth of the accusations and throwing himself entirely on their mercy. Deputies were sent to ascertain whether he had himself subscribed that confession. Bacon was now quite broken down: 'My lords,' said he, 'it is my act, my hand, my heart. I beseech your lordships to be merciful to a broken reed.'

He was too ill to appear in Westminster Hall the next day, when the judgment was pronounced. The sentence was very severe; 'the more so, because the Lords knew that it would not be executed.'² He was condemned to pay a fine of £40,000 and to be imprisoned in the Tower during the king's pleasure. He was declared incapable of holding any office in the State or of sitting in Parliament, and prohibited for life from appearing at Court. He was sent to the Tower, but only remained there two days, and retired to his seat at Gorhambury in Hertfordshire. In 1624, the rest of his punishment was remitted, and he might have again taken his place in the House of Lords, had not he been prevented by age or disinclination. The last years of his life were occupied by his favourite studies. He caught cold while making an experiment in frosty weather, early in 1626, and died at Highgate at the house of his friend the Earl of Arundel. His successor was Dr. Williams, the Bishop of Lincoln. It was long since one of the clergy had been Chancellor, and the appointment was unpopular. The severity exercised against these delinquents tended to the maintenance

¹ Hallam, 359, note.

² Lord Macaulay.

of justice, but the next act of parliamentary vengeance was an instance of the unwarrantable violence too often produced by religious bigotry. When it was made known to Parliament that a Roman Catholic barrister, named Floyd, had spoken in injurious terms of the Elector Palatine and his wife, the Commons in a paroxysm of fury determined to requite the utterance of a flippant expression by a cruel and degrading punishment. The king endeavoured to interpose, alleging with justice that the Commons had no right to condemn one who was not a member of their House, but they refused to hearken to his suggestion that the case should be intrusted to Government, and the Upper House, who after some contention succeeded in constituting themselves the judges, proved their zeal in the cause of the Palatinate by even adding to the severity of the sentence. Floyd, after being degraded from the rank of a gentleman and declared incapable of giving evidence, was condemned to ride from the Fleet prison to Cheapside with his face to the horse's tail and without a saddle, to be exhibited in like manner in Westminster, to stand on two days in the pillory for two hours, to be whipped through the streets, to pay a fine of £5,000, and to be subsequently imprisoned in Newgate. The whipping was omitted at the expostulation of Prince Charles, the rest of the sentence is said to have been executed. The 'outrageous cruelty' thus inflicted for so trifling an offence is 'an unhappy proof of the disregard of the principles of equity and moderation' to which popular assemblies are liable, when inflamed by passion. 'The cold-blooded deliberate policy of the Lords is still more disgusting than the wild fury of the Lower House.'¹

James soon afterwards adjourned Parliament for four months. The members before they separated entered their protest on the journals that they would, in case of the continuance of troubles in Germany, be ready to sacrifice their lives and fortunes for the restoration of the Prince Palatine and the support of the Protestant cause in Europe.² So great was the enthusiasm that one who was present declared that 'the like had scarce ever been seen in Parliament.'

When after five months Parliament reassembled, it was notified by the king's orders that an embassy had been sent to Germany, and that a body of troops under Sir Horace Vere were defending the Palatinate. It was needful to vote more money lest these troops should mutiny, and it was stated that to maintain an effective war in Germany for one year would

¹ Hallam's words, 'Constitutional History,' i. 359-361.

² Lingard, ix. 189; Hallam, i. 363.

require £900,000. The Commons, either recoiling from so large an outlay, or doubting, possibly, the zeal with which the war might be pursued, voted but £70,000. They then turned to discuss the general grievances, also the increase of Popery, and declared their wish that the Prince of Wales should marry a Protestant, Spain being the great enemy of the Prince Palatine. A petition to the king on these subjects was proposed by Sir Edward Coke, but was opposed by the courtiers as without precedent. To obviate scruples, words were inserted signifying that they 'did not mean to press upon the king's most undoubted and royal prerogative.' James had withdrawn to Newmarket 'to be farther from the sound of the discontent.' A copy was privately sent to him there, on which he immediately sent a peremptory letter to the Speaker, complaining that 'some fiery, popular, and turbulent spirits' had been emboldened to argue on matters far beyond their reach and capacity, and directing that the House should be forbidden to meddle with his government on mysteries of state, such as his son's projected marriage, or anything touching his honour or that of his friends.

He assured them that he would not hear their petition if it touched on any of these forbidden points. James added threats concerning his power to punish the misdemeanours which any member of Parliament might commit, either during or subsequent to a sitting.

This letter was received on December 3, 1621, from which time, says Mr. Forster, 'may be dated the beginning of that open warfare of principles' between the king and Parliament, which caused the destruction of the line of Stuart.¹

The House of Commons did not betray any undue warmth on receiving the royal message, but maintained their firmness. They appointed a committee to draw up a petition, which in respectful language defended their former proceedings, expressing their opinion that what concerned either the king's safety and honour or that of the kingdom could not be unfit for their consideration; and that they held their freedom of speech as the inheritance derived from their ancestors, which they prayed the king to confirm. This declaration and the prior petition were taken to the king at Newmarket by twelve members, one of whom was Mr. Pym. James refused to receive the first; to the second he wrote himself a long reply, again denouncing the interference of the House in his private affairs, boasting that his mediation had produced good effects in Europe, and

¹ Forster's 'Life of Pym,' 17.

finally declaring that the privileges of Parliament ought not to be considered an undoubted right and inheritance, but were derived from royal grace, and if carried too far, might be withdrawn. It is dangerous for a sovereign to commit himself in writing. The king's advisers were alarmed, and when James heard that a committee had been immediately appointed to prepare a protest, he allowed Secretary Calvert to go to the House and offer some explanation of his letter. The secretary called the king's closing threats 'a slip of the pen at the close of a long answer,' but this excuse did not avail.

It was December 18, the eve of the Christmas recess, and the Commons determined before they separated to record a protest. It was six o'clock in the evening, by candlelight—a time very unusual in those days—that the committee brought in their protest to the effect 'that the liberties and privileges of Parliament are the ancient and undoubted right and inheritance of English subjects, that arduous and urgent affairs concerning the king, the defence of the realm, the Church of England, the making of laws and the redress of grievances, are proper subjects of counsel and debate in Parliament, and that every member had a right to freedom of speech concerning such matters and should be free from all impeachment unless by the censure of the House itself.'¹

When the king was informed of this formal act of opposition he hurried up to London from Newmarket, and, having hastily assembled the Privy Council and the judges who were in London, commanded the clerk of the House of Commons to bring the journal-book, and with his own hand tore out the offensive protest, ordering the Council to register his act.

Having dissolved Parliament, he summoned Coke, Philips, Pym, and other members; and, as they refused the required submission, sent them to close confinement in separate prisons, in which they for some time remained. The Earls of Oxford and Southampton were likewise arrested, and four members of the Lower House who had rendered themselves obnoxious to the king were compelled to take service in Ireland.² Part of the House of Lords had agreed with the proceedings of the Commons, discontent was general throughout the nation, and numerous political pamphlets were circulated containing strong reflections upon the king and his ministers. 'In all times,' said the lawyer Selden, 'the English princes have done some-

¹ Hallam, i. 367; Lingard, ix. 196.

² Hallam, i. 368.

thing illegal to get money ; but then came a Parliament, and all was well.'¹

A new scheme for a benevolence followed the dismissal of Parliament. The magistrates all over the country were urged to collect liberal subscriptions, and to send to the Council the names of all who refused 'out of obstinacy or disaffection.'

Desirous of conciliating the Roman Catholic party preparatory to his son's marriage, James ordered the liberation of those imprisoned as recusants, and, fearing the comments of the Puritan divines on such lenity, he addressed a mandate to the clergy forbidding all below the rank of a dean to allude in their sermons to any other subject than the ordinary topics of religion. Moreover, it was expressly ordered that no preacher should presume to discourse concerning the duty or authority of princes. The Puritans murmured loudly ; and some of the preachers who disobeyed were thrown into prison. The new Lord Keeper, the Bishop of Lincoln, is said to have tried to mitigate severity which he knew to be impolitic.

The Puritans were strict observers of the Sabbath, as they termed the Sunday, and held it sinful to indulge in holiday amusements on that day, although such pastimes had not been forbidden by the 'founders of the English Reformation.' James, who persisted in attempts to revolutionise the convictions of his subjects, now published a declaration, to be read in churches, permitting all who had previously attended the church service to indulge in dancing, archery, and other sports, bear-baiting only being prohibited.

This arbitrary proceeding stimulated the House of Commons to pass bills enjoining greater strictness, and a Mr. Shepherd, who ventured in 1621 to observe lightly that Saturday² was the day for which alone their observances should be framed, was compelled to receive a reprimand on his knees, and was even expelled the House for daring to jest on so grave a subject.³

From the time when the king fixed his hopes on his son's marriage with the Princess of Spain, the popular feeling against that alliance had been increasing. With the prospect that the marriage would be soon agreed upon, the Earl of Bristol proceeded to Madrid, when a strange freak, played by Prince Charles and the favourite Buckingham, occasioned still further dissatisfaction.

Eager for an adventure, the prince and the marquis left

¹ Quoted from Selden's 'Table Talk,' by Miss Aikin, ii. 301.

² The old Judaic Sabbath.

³ Hallam, i. 396-399.

England in February, 1623, in disguise, under the names of Thomas and John Smith, and after indulging at Paris in a day's pleasure, arrived suddenly at Madrid. At their request James promised to conceal their journey from his Council, and he gave them a written promise to ratify any terms on which they might agree with the Spanish minister. He raised Buckingham to the rank of duke, that he might associate on equal terms with the *grandees* of Spain, and forwarded to his son everything possible which could add lustre to his embassy. On their arrival they threw off disguise, and Prince Charles was received with the utmost honour, but in England his sudden disappearance excited surprise and alarm, and Archbishop Abbot strongly remonstrated with the king against his conduct in sending his son into Spain without the consent of the Council. 'Believe it, Sir,' said he, 'howsoever his return may be safe, the drawers of him to that action will not pass away unpunished.' He urged that the toleration of the Catholics, which the king endeavoured 'to set up by proclamation,' could not be done without a Parliament, 'unless your Majesty will let your subjects see that you take to yourself a liberty to throw down the laws of your land at pleasure.'¹

The hesitation of the Pope to grant a dispensation for the marriage until the most favourable terms had been obtained for the English Catholics occasioned delay, James resolutely refusing to acknowledge the Pope's spiritual supremacy, but promising to abstain from any act of hostility towards the Roman Catholics. The Prince of Wales, in his letters to the Pope, appeared to incline towards Catholicism. The Spanish ambassadors informed their sovereign of the unpopularity with which all such concessions were viewed in England, and the marriage was also disliked by the clergy and nobility of Spain. Both a public and a private treaty were agreed upon. According to the first, which the Lords of the Council swore to observe, in the royal chapel at Westminster, it was arranged that any children of the marriage should remain for the first ten years under their mother's care, and that she should be allowed chaplains and the full rites of her religion. James, when alone in the house of the Spanish ambassador, agreed also to a private treaty, in which he promised to exert all his influence to obtain from Parliament the repeal of the penal statutes.² The day of the marriage had been fixed, when it was deferred on account of the death of the Pope, Gregory XV., to await the ratification of the articles by his successor.

¹ Lingard, ix. 204, note.

² Lingard, ix. 207; Hallam, i. 409.

No difficulties would have then prevented the marriage, if Buckingham had not for some reason decided against it, quarrelled with the Spanish minister, and hurried the prince from Madrid. Charles had exchanged costly gifts with the Infanta, who was styled the 'Princess of England;' it was arranged that the marriage should be celebrated at Madrid on November 29, an illustrious proxy standing for Prince Charles, and even a platform covered with tapestry had been erected leading from the palace to the church, when, four days before the appointed time, couriers reached Madrid, desiring Lord Bristol to surrender the prince's proxy and return to England, alleging the state of the Palatinate as a pretext for the indefinite postponement of the marriage now at the eleventh hour. The King of Spain was indignant at this treatment of his sister. The Infanta resigned her short-lived title, the study of the English language, and the jewels with which she had been presented by the prince. Although King James received his son and the duke with kindness, his mortification was evident at such a conclusion of his long-treasured hope.

Buckingham resolved to court the favour of the Protestant party, and advised James to assemble Parliament, from which he might obtain that pecuniary aid which he had expected from the marriage-portion of the Spanish princess. It was in a tone of unusual humility that James addressed Parliament in February, 1624, faintly bidding for applause on the ground of having steadfastly maintained the *Protestant* cause.

The two Houses met in conference, and Buckingham delivered before them a long and specious history of the proceedings in Spain. Charles, 'early initiated in the art of deception,' stood by to confirm his statements; whilst the Earl of Bristol, who could have exposed their misrepresentations, was required to absent himself.¹ The protest of the Spanish ambassador was unheeded, and Parliament voted an address to the king condemning the existing treaties of peace. James shuddered at the prospect of a war which he had not the spirit to oppose. He required present help, and offered that the grant of money should be placed under the control of commissioners whom the Parliament might appoint, promising that he would not end the war without their concurrence, concessions actually contrary to the royal prerogative which he held so dear.² The Spanish ambassador left England in anger. The prince and Buckingham instigated a parliamentary impeachment of the Earl of Middlesex, the Lord Treasurer, who was accused of some

¹ Lingard, ix. 217.

² *Ib.* 218.

acts of bribery, and, having been unanimously found guilty by the peers, was condemned to pay a fine of £50,000. 'This impeachment,' says Hallam, 'was of the highest moment to the Commons, as it restored for ever that salutary constitutional right which the single precedent of Lord Bacon might have been inefficient to establish against the ministers of the Crown.'¹ The most important statute passed by this Parliament prohibited all monopolies in trade, which they declared to be contrary to the ancient laws of the realm. A new treaty of marriage occupied the king's attention even before the treaty with Spain had been actually broken off. When the prince and Buckingham passed through Paris on their way to Spain they had attended a court ball at which the young princess Henrietta Maria, sister of the king, was present; and, the Spanish alliance having definitely failed, Charles now determined to propose for the hand of this princess. Louis XIII. readily gave his consent. The only difficulty again appeared to be to reconcile her requirements respecting the Roman Catholic faith with the promise so lately made to the English Parliament. In respect to the children of the union, there was now a demand that they should remain under the French princess's care until they were thirteen years of age; her portion was to be 800,000 crowns, she agreeing to renounce for herself and her descendants all claim to the French succession. Secret articles promising indulgence towards the English Catholics were agreed to by the King and the prince. The long truce between Spain and the Netherlands had expired, and Buckingham had taken the opportunity to conclude a defensive league between Great Britain and the Seven United Provinces. The preparations for the recovery of the Palatinate had been conducted with great remissness, and a considerable number of those who had enlisted to assist Frederick perished by neglect or from an epidemic on reaching the coast of Holland.

James did not live to welcome the French bride. He was taken ill and expired on March 27, 1625, in the fifty-ninth year of his age, after a reign of twenty-two years. The queen had died in the year 1618. Only two children survived him, Prince Charles, and Elizabeth, the wife of the ex-king of Bohemia. The funeral was solemnised in Westminster Abbey, and Bishop Williams, the Lord Keeper, preached the sermon in a style of panegyric by which James would have been much gratified, comparing the late king to Solomon. The high praise

¹ 'Constitutional History,' i. p. 372.

bestowed upon James for the equality with which he dispensed justice to rich and poor proves that this was considered a rare virtue in a sovereign. 'I could tell you,' said the preacher, 'that which will never be believed in later times, of a lord that died for a vile varlet.' The case referred to, and on which Lord Bacon also bestowed especial praise, was that of Lord Sanquhar, a Scottish nobleman who unfortunately lost an eye in a trial of skill with a fencing master named Turner, in which both parties violated the prescribed rules. Five years after this occurrence, Sanquhar avenged it by sending two hired assassins to shoot Turner in his school. Sanquhar was apprehended and executed for this murder. It has been noticed as extraordinary that the bishop omitted all reference to that excellent translation of the Holy Scriptures which was undertaken after the conference at Hampton Court, and on which forty-seven translators are said to have been engaged, the king paying much attention to their work. This, which was completed in 1611, is the version still in use. The panegyrics of royal preachers afford little proof of a sovereign's real character, but the bishop's retrospect of progress during this reign was based on facts, although the king's influence had been of little benefit except in so far as it maintained peace. 'The Scottish feuds quite abolished; all kinds of learning highly improved; manufactures at home daily invented; the north of Ireland religiously planted; East India well traded, Persia and China visited; lastly, all parts of the four quarters of the world' (somewhat too comprehensive a summary) 'to us freed and opened,' were benefits which, in this preacher's eyes, the country owed to King James. The felicitation concerning Ireland applied only to 'the north.' The English power had gradually triumphed over the half-savage chieftains who ruled 'beyond the Pale,' and soon after James ascended the English throne the last O'Donnell and O'Neill, who held the rank of independent princes, were brought to London by Mountjoy, the Lord Deputy, and kissed the hand of the King of England.

English law thenceforward extended, at least nominally, to every part of Ireland; but, unhappily, 'the new feud of Protestant and Papist inflamed the old feud of Saxon and Celt.' The rites of religion were denied to the uncivilised race who still remained attached to the ancient faith and used the Celtic tongue, and consequently their frequent acts of rebellion against the English rule were justified in their own eyes, and those of the Roman Catholic powers of the Continent, by the pleas of patriotism and devotion. Their chiefs, when driven

from their homes, were gladly received at the foreign courts as exiles for their rights and religion.¹

James sought to improve upon the plan of colonising Ulster, which had been adopted by Elizabeth, and encouraged rich Scottish and English adventurers to take lots of 1,500 or 2,000 acres, grants of land being also given to some of the native chiefs who appeared disposed to live peaceably. In this way, a large portion of land was planted which had been hitherto uncultivated, and the example given by settlers who were accustomed to order served as some restraint on their turbulent neighbours; but still complaints were continually made of injustice and oppression. Lord Bacon, addressing the Irish Chief Justice in 1617, set forth that Ireland had been reclaimed from desolation and barbarity to humanity and civility. This he declared to be the king's 'garland of heroic virtue and felicity, denied to his progenitors, and not yet conducted to perfection.' 'So as that kingdom which, even within twenty years, wise men were in doubt whether they should not wish it *in a pool*, is like now to become almost a garden and younger sister to Great Britain.' Bacon advised temperance and equality in matters of religion, 'lest Ireland *civil* should yet become more dangerous to us than Ireland *savage*.' During a few years the conciliating policy appears to have been attended with success; but, in 1623, Lord Falkland, the new Lord Deputy, was induced to publish a proclamation commanding all Roman Catholic clergy to leave the country within fifty days. Inquiries were made into the titles to estates, former grants were in many cases declared invalid, and evidence was brought forward that almost every foot of ground occupied by the native Irish belonged to the Crown. The stipulation of James that three-fourths of the land should be restored to the original owners was disregarded, many persons were stripped entirely of their inheritance, and several septs were transplanted by force to the remotest parts of the country.² Although extensive plantations were made along the sea-coast of Dublin and Waterford, and tranquillity apparently succeeded to rebellion, the injustice with which the lands were apportioned, and the demand of fresh fines on every change of possession, had sown seeds of antipathy and revenge, and in the next reign feuds, rebellions, and massacres long continued to convulse and depopulate the country. 'In these two leading grievances, the penal laws against Catholics, and

¹ Lingard, ix. 145; Macaulay's 'History of England,' i. 68.

² *Sept* is the Irish name for a clan, or tribe.

the inquisition into defective titles,' says Hallam, 'we trace, beyond a doubt, the primary source of the rebellion in 1641.'¹

The charter which Queen Elizabeth granted to a company of English merchants, to conduct commerce on the western coast of India, was confirmed by James, and, in 1615, Sir Thomas Roe went on an embassy to Delhi, the Court of the Mogul Emperor. The minds of the English people were excited by the descriptions subsequently given of Indian pageantry, and of a throne said to be so costly that its jewellery more than equalled in value all the crowns and coronets of the western world. Such was the beginning of the East India Company.

The coast of America had been discovered by Europeans nearly at the same time as that of India, and the beginning of commerce took place in both these far-distant countries nearly at the same time. It was in 1606 that the English 'Virginian Company' was endowed with an extensive territory by King James, on the eastern coast of North America. Several of the nobility and gentry took part in the speculation, and the English people exulted in the anticipated success. Shakespeare, whose friend, the Earl of Southampton, took part in this company, represented Cranmer as speaking of King James prophetically as the planter of colonies: 'Wherever the bright sun of heaven shall shine, his honour and the greatness of his name shall be, and make new nations.'² But, as usual, the golden dreams of the projectors were disappointed.

Uncultivated lands required much husbandry before they could become productive, and the complaint was frequently repeated that more men were wanted in the colony. In 1618 the colonists petitioned the English Government to give them 'vagabonds and condemned men,' whom they might use as slaves, and the next year the London gaols were emptied of a hundred prisoners for that purpose. In 1620 a Dutch vessel brought the first convoy of African negroes, who were immediately sold to the colonists. Thus began negro slavery in North America. America became a convenient place of banishment for those men feared or suspected at home. 'It was not,' says an American writer, 'criminals alone that were sent into this bondage, but captives of war of all nations, and state prisoners, victims of the Star Chamber and of the ecclesiastical courts; persons suspected of traitorous designs upon the

¹ 'Constitutional History,' ii. 542; Lingard, ix. 153-155. The 18th chapter of the 'Constitutional History' contains an interesting sketch of the history of Ireland.

² See the concluding scene of *Henry VIII.*

monarchy, and infidelity to the Court theology; all were herded together with petty pilferers, convicted murderers, and heathen blacks, and driven by overseers to work in the tobacco fields of their masters.¹

Severe penalties had been from time immemorial adjudged against the imputed crimes of sorcery and witchcraft, but there was in this country little persecution of those unfortunate and often self-deluded persons called witches, till James exasperated English bigotry, and exhibited his own learning, by publishing a work on Demonology. It is said that about a hundred wretched persons were put to death in this reign on account of this superstitious belief.²

The poet Waller related that on the day when James dissolved the Parliament of 1621, in anger at their refusal of supplies, he went to Court and saw the king dining in public, and Bishops Andrews of Chichester and Neyle of Ely standing behind his chair. James turning to the bishops asked them aloud their opinion whether when needful he might not levy money from his subjects without the interposition of Parliament. Neyle returned without hesitation the most courtly affirmative. Andrews at first tried to excuse himself from giving his opinion, but when the king insisted, replied, 'I think, Sir, that it is lawful for your Majesty to take my brother Neyle's money, for he offers it.' Nothing, as it has been said, but the happy point of the answer could atone for its daring. When Bishop Andrews died, in 1626, the young John Milton, then in his eighteenth year, gave him the tribute of a Latin elegy.³

James thought the position of a constitutional king degrading. His early ties, and his position when Sovereign of Scotland, had inclined him to follow the examples of Spain and France. Those countries had formerly their senates, or free assemblies of nobles, but despotism had triumphed, and that doctrine of 'The Divine Right of Kings,' which, when published by Dr. Cowell, James had been induced to suppress, was scarcely ever disputed in France and Spain.⁴

After nine years of negotiations, James had succeeded in arranging the marriage of his son with a princess of an equally

¹ Olmsted's 'Slave States of America,' 219-225.

² Aikin, ii. 167.

³ Ib. 272.

⁴ See Guizot, 'Histoire de la Révolution d'Angleterre,' pp. 3-5; also a comparison of the freedom of England and France in Hallam's 'Constitutional History,' i. 277. The great French assembly, the States-General, was compelled to close its sittings in 1614, not to be resumed till the storms of the Revolution of 1789.

royal race, but not without concessions to the Catholics, which at all times excited the jealousy of that increasing body of Puritans who were the stanchest guardians of the privileges of Parliament. The difference between these and the violent prelatists, who, as advocates of the royal prerogative, were in favour at Whitehall, had been constantly widening; and Charles, like his father, a zealous episcopalian, 'liked a Papist much better than a Puritan.'¹ Originally a term of reproach employed against those who assumed marked purity and preciseness, the name of *Puritan* was often indiscriminately given either to stricter religionists or to upholders of liberty. 'If any,' says the excellent Mrs. Hutchinson, 'out of mere morality and civil honesty, discountenanced the abominations of those days, he was a Puritan; if any showed favour to any godly honest person, kept them company, or protected them from unjust oppression, he was a Puritan; if any gentleman in his county stood up for any public interest, for good order or government, he was a Puritan;' and the character which the Court party assigned to the Puritan was that of a factious hypocrite.² A calm bystander surveying, on the one hand, the increasing determination of Parliament in maintaining the liberties of the nation, and, on the other, the domineering obstinacy of the Court, could scarcely fail to forebode the storms of the succeeding reign.³

¹ Lord Macaulay, i. 83.

² See Fuller's 'Church History,' book ix. section i. 67, and Mrs. Hutchinson's 'Memoir of Col. Hutchinson.'

³ Hallam, i. 373.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

CHARLES I.

A.D. 1625—1649.

CHARLES was in his twenty-fifth year when he ascended the throne. The treaty of marriage with the Princess Henrietta was concluded without delay, and it was arranged that the marriage ceremony should take place at the beginning of May in Paris, where, probably in deference to the scruples of those who might be offended by their young sovereign's presence at a Roman Catholic ceremonial, the Duke of Chévreuse was appointed proxy for the king. The Duke of Buckingham went to Paris with a large retinue to escort the royal bride to England. After some delay, occasioned by the illness of the King of France, Charles, attended by a number of the English nobility, received Henrietta at Dover on June 12. The contract was renewed at Canterbury, and soon after arriving at Whitehall the king and queen withdrew to Hampton Court from apprehension of the plague, which again, as at the accession of James, and with still greater virulence, was ravaging London.¹

The dignity of the young king's demeanour, contrasting so favourably with that of his father, immediately produced a favourable impression. James, although a learned man, took pleasure in the company of court-fools and idle jesters, but these received no encouragement from Charles, who could appreciate instructive conversation and had taste for the fine arts.²

His pressing need of money forced him to summon Parliament, which, from fear of the plague, was adjourned in July to

¹ More than 41,000 persons are said to have died from the plague in London and Westminster during the year 1625.—Lingard, ix. 238.

² This praise was given by Mrs. Hutchinson, no flattering observer.—'Memoirs of Colonel Hutchinson,' p. 65.

Oxford. The House of Commons looked with much jealousy on the concessions lately made to Roman Catholics, and on the influence of the King's Catholic allies, and there was reason for distrust.

Sir John Eliot, one of the foremost constitutional leaders in the House, had received information that English ships, which had been professedly lent to France for service against Spain, were actually employed to aid the French king in conquering his own Protestant subjects at La Rochelle, whom the King of Spain, inconsistently enough, but in revenge for aid furnished to the rebels in the Low Countries, was now supporting in their struggle for liberty.

Charles pressed seven merchantmen for this expedition to Rochelle, who were commanded by Admiral Pennington; but when the sailors discovered the purpose for which they were engaged they insisted on returning to the Downs. They were twice sent forth again by the Government, Charles giving Pennington a warrant to sink any ship which might attempt to evade his orders. One vessel, however, returned to the English coast, the others were manned by Frenchmen, and were retained in the service until the end of the war. Pennington protested against this disgraceful act, intending to lay the whole proceedings before Parliament, but through Court influence the affair was concealed from public notice until after the dissolution.¹ The Duke of Buckingham, who was high admiral and the most powerful personage in the State, became the principal object of the national aversion. 'The people, loth to lay the miscarriage of things at the king's own door, began to entertain a universal hatred of the duke.'² To save Buckingham from impeachment, Charles dissolved Parliament on August 12.

This abrupt dissolution, before adequate supplies had been granted, left the Government in great straits for money, not only for State affairs, but even to supply the wants of the royal household. The gradual changes which had deprived the King of England of old feudal prerogatives left him dependent on Parliament both for war expenses and for even the support of his royal dignity. It had been proposed in Parliament early in the last reign that James should receive £200,000 per annum, in compensation for the loss of feudal rights, but this had never received the assent of the House of Commons.

¹ Lingard, ix. 256, note; Hallam, i. 414; Forster's 'Life of Eliot,' p. 35.

² Mrs. Hutchinson's words.

Every possible exertion was made to raise money, by terror or entreaty, and Charles condescended to borrow £3,000 of the corporations of Salisbury and Southampton, on the joint security of two of his ministers.¹ Like desperate gamblers, Charles and Buckingham rested their hopes on expected profits to be obtained from the war with Spain. The rich convoys sent from the West Indies might be intercepted.

Part of the money which they obtained was employed in fitting out an expedition against Cadiz. It proved a failure, and a thousand men are said to have perished from disease before Lord Wimbledon, their commander, returned to Plymouth after an absence of two months. Charles was much afflicted at this result. He had no immediate resource but to pawn the heirlooms of the Crown, and to diminish the Court retinue, and Buckingham carried the Court plate and jewels to Holland as pledges for a loan.

The young queen was annoyed, and her brother, the French king, was displeased, when Charles, who found his wife's large retinue both unpopular and expensive, sent no less than sixty of her suite back to France.² There was no escape from the obligation of reassembling Parliament, but the expedient was tried of appointing some of the most formidable objectors sheriffs, for during tenure of that office they were debarred from taking their seats. The friends of these members strongly resented their exclusion, and the artifice tended still further to exasperate the nation against Buckingham. Charles was crowned at Candlemas; in February the second Parliament of the reign assembled, consisting chiefly of the same men as had been before elected, and in a state of increased irritation at the king's conduct. They promised to grant subsidies, provided the grievances of which they complained were redressed. The king's pride spurned the condition. He threatened the House that it would be 'worse for themselves,' if they did not increase supplies, and promptly pass them.³ But no menaces could change the determination of the Commons to impeach Buckingham. The king punished the boldness of Sir John Eliot by sending him to the Tower. There was especial reason for the duke to dread the Earl of Bristol's evidence, as, having been the English minister at Madrid, he would deny Buckingham's statements concerning the transactions in Spain. As soon as the earl returned to

¹ Lingard, ix, 345.

² Ib. 264.

³ Hallam, i. 376. Hallam says of the king's language to this Parliament, 'I know of nothing under the Tudors of greater arrogance than this language.'

England he was accordingly put under restraint, and forbidden to appear at Court or in his place in Parliament. The king's displeasure was even shown to those who paid the earl private visits. When at length, after some delay, the earl received the usual formal summons to Parliament, a letter was at the same time sent forbidding him to avail himself of it.

Bristol forwarded the letter to the Lords, as it concerned their privileges as well as his own, and demanded permission to bring forward his charges against Buckingham. The Attorney-General tried to stifle the attack by accusing Bristol of high treason, but the Lords decided that the accusation did not impair his testimony, and that his evidence against the duke should be heard. His principal charges were as follows: that Buckingham had by false statements induced Charles to go to Spain, had urged his adoption of the Catholic faith, had whilst in Spain disgraced himself and his country by dissolute conduct, had broken off the treaty of marriage owing to personal ill-will towards the Spanish ministry, and, lastly, that on his return he had by misrepresentations been guilty of deceiving both his sovereign and the Parliament.

These charges were entered on the journals of the House of Lords, and were followed by still more important articles of impeachment sent up by the House of Commons, accusing the duke of having purchased several of the highest offices in the kingdom for his own aggrandisement, of having employed for his own use part of the revenue of the Crown, and of having extorted £10,000 from the East India Company. They declared that he had sent an English squadron to assist in the operations against the French Protestants, and that he had given medicine to the late king unsanctioned by the royal physicians, which accelerated his death—an accusation for which there was no foundation whatever. Buckingham drew up a reply with the assistance of Sir Nicholas Hyde. He acknowledged having purchased the wardenship of the Cinque Ports, which he tried to justify, but faltered at the charge of sending ships against Rochelle.¹ Such were the articles of impeachment now framed against Buckingham, when, in utter defiance of Parliament, Charles conferred additional distinction on his favourite by nominating him Chancellor of the University of Cambridge. The heads of the colleges promised obedience to the royal wish, but the younger members named the Earl of Berkshire in preference, and after a severe contest the duke obtained the honourable office by a majority of three votes only.

¹ Lingard, ix. 253-256.

The Commons, now highly indignant at the king's conduct, voted such an election an insult to their House. The dispute was, however, suddenly ended by the dissolution of Parliament on June 15, Charles curtly replying with impatience to the Lords when they requested a short delay, 'No, not of one minute.' The Earl of Bristol was immediately sent back to the Tower.¹ After this second dissolution, Charles laboured under great pecuniary difficulties. 'On Monday,' wrote a contemporary, 'the judges sat at Westminster Hall to persuade the people to pay subsidies; but there arose a great tumultuous shout amongst them, "A Parliament! a Parliament! else no subsidies!"' In Westminster, among 5,000 persons, there were only about thirty, and those all of them king's servants, who were willing to respond to the demand. In Kent 'the whole county denied.'

This plan failing, arbitrary taxation in another form was attempted. Commissioners were sent to different parts of the country, who demanded a certain proportion of property from every man. The king wrote to all the county magistrates, alleging reasons for the late dissolution of Parliament, and requiring the troops of the different counties to be in readiness, as he was 'threatened with invasion,' 'a pretext,' says Hallam, 'evidently employed to shelter the king's illegal proceedings.'² Although orders were given that the names of all who refused to contribute should be sent to Government, submission was far from general. Punishment was inflicted on recusants, the common people were impressed as sailors, the gentry being summoned to the council-table, and many of them cast into prison. Among those who refused the demand were five knights, who had sufficient spirit to defend their cause at their own risk and expense, demanding their release from prison, on the ground that no specific charge had been brought against them. At this critical juncture for English liberty the High Church party cast their influence decidedly upon the side of despotism.

Those who refused the general loan 'were not only imprisoned, but preached at.'³ The Rev. Drs. Sibthorp and Mainwaring delivered sermons denying the constitutional right of Parliament, and vindicating the claims of the king. Dr. Abbot, Archbishop of Canterbury, having refused his licence for the sale of Sibthorp's sermons in his diocese, the king revenged

¹ Lingard, ix. 257.

² Hallam, i. 381, referring to Mede's Letters, &c.

³ Hallam, i. 416, and Guizot, i. 31.

himself by debarring the archbishop from exercising archiepiscopal jurisdiction, and confining him to one of his country residences. The House of Commons, which met in 1628, impeached Mainwaring before the Lords, who condemned him to pay a fine of £1,000, and to be suspended from his ministry during three years. But Charles almost immediately overrode this decision, and advanced Mainwaring a few years afterwards to the rank of a bishop. The plea set up by the five knights concerning their arbitrary imprisonment was argued with great ability on their behalf by several eminent lawyers, who urged that Magna Charta provides in its 29th section that no freeman shall be imprisoned unless by the lawful judgment of his peers, and according to the law of the land. Offenders might be kept in custody before trial, but the charge against them must be specified. Ample proof was set forth, from the words of judges under Henry VI. and Edward IV., that the king's command could not justify an illegal act. 'The king,' said a Chief Justice in the latter reign, 'cannot arrest a man upon suspicion of felony or treason, as any of his subjects may, because, if he should wrong a man by such arrest, the subject can have no remedy against him.'¹ These judgments, dating from times of disorder and violence, bear witness to the progressive establishment of safeguards against tyranny. The Attorney-General pleaded the occasional infractions of these legal axioms, and the implicit obedience due to the monarch, who could, according to the legal maxim, 'do no wrong.' Papists and other State prisoners had been detained in prison during many years from political jealousy alone. Some of the prisoners in the Tower had been in confinement since their early youth. Should they, it was asked, put in their plea against further detention, 'would the Court deliver them?'² The judges decided in favour of the Crown, and the knights were consequently remanded to prison. But it was plain to everybody that if the special command of the king, or the mere authority of the Privy Council were sufficient warrant for imprisonment, the especial provisions of Magna Charta were set at naught, and that something further must be done to prevent these violations of justice. Hence originated the celebrated 'Petition of Right.' Nearly eighty gentlemen had been imprisoned for refusing to contribute to the loan: those of lower rank who disobeyed the order were sent to the fleet or the army; yet still money came in but slowly. The king therefore liberated these prisoners, and summoned another Par-

¹ Words spoken by Chief Justice Markham to Edward IV., Hallam, i. 385.

² Hallam, i. 386-388.

liament. Hampden and other patriot leaders were immediately re-elected, and Parliament assembled early in 1628. No one living could remember in any year so many violations of public liberty as had been committed in the year 1627.¹ The House of Commons now brought forward their 'Petition of Right,' which stated the principal abuses of the royal authority as follows: 'That, contrary to Magna Charta, freemen had been required to lend money to the king; that those who refused to do so had been molested or sent to prison; that soldiers had been billeted on private houses, causing much grievance to the inhabitants; and punishment had been inflicted by martial law, contrary to the rights and liberties of the subject and to the laws of the nation.'² Oliver Cromwell was a member of this Parliament, and spoke strongly against the favours lately shown by the king towards the clergy who had opposed the rights of the people.

Charles was naturally irritated by being required to agree to a declaration which condemned his mode of government, and which would restrain him within the bounds of a constitutional king. To assent to it was, in his opinion, to forfeit his most valuable rights. But, as he wanted the five subsidies, he resolved to dissemble, and ordered the following answer to be written under the petition: 'The king willeth that right be done according to the laws and customs of the realm, and that the statutes be put in due execution, that his subjects may have no cause to complain of any wrongs or oppression contrary to their just rights and liberties, to the preservation whereof he holds himself in conscience as well obliged as of his own prerogative.'

The patriot leaders were highly incensed by this evasive language, and some members would have uttered invectives against the Duke of Buckingham, had not the Speaker urged their forbearance, alleging the king's command. After the debate had been repeatedly adjourned, Charles yielded, alarmed at the duke's unpopularity, and taking his seat on the throne, directed that the answer already given should be cut off, and his consent expressed in the usual form, 'Let right be done as it is desired.'

The House immediately voted the requisite supplies, and general satisfaction was felt throughout the country. Charles

¹ Hallam.

² See Sandford's 'Great Rebellion,' p. 228. The 'Declaratory Statute,' guarding against the repetition of the four principal grievances specified, still bears the name of 'the Petition of Right,' not being drawn in the common form of an Act of Parliament.—Hallam, i. 391.

had thus promised in set terms to govern under the restraint of the law. 'But from that time,' says Lord Macaulay, 'he redoubled his oppressions, as if to avenge himself for the shame of having been compelled to renounce them. Estates were laid under shameful impositions, houses ransacked, men imprisoned,' notwithstanding 'these solemn promises of the king.'¹ Parliament was prorogued at the end of June, before which a strong remonstrance was presented to the king against the excessive power exercised by the Duke of Buckingham.

On August 23, Buckingham was murdered, when he was at Portsmouth ready to sail to La Rochelle. The assassin might easily have escaped, but gave himself up, declaring his name to be John Felton, a retired officer, and assigning as the motive of the deed his strong conviction that the duke was the author of many calamities to England. Charles proposed that Felton should be put on the rack, but the judges, warned by the late proceedings in Parliament to be careful of the law, unanimously declared that the use of torture was illegal, thus proving that, 'amidst all the arbitrary measures of the time, a truer sense of the inviolability of the law had begun to prevail.'²

Felton underwent the usual punishment for murder, and before his death acknowledged the wickedness of the deed. Thus perished, at the age of six-and-thirty, George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham, Lord High Treasurer, cut off in the flower of his days while braving the indignation of the people, upon whose liberties he was encouraging his sovereign to trample. It may be doubted whether the assassin's weapon did not anticipate and preserve him from encountering, a few years later, the sterner fate which befel a far greater man.³

General indignation had been felt in England when Buckingham sent an English fleet to assist the King of France in blocking up the port of Rochelle—a city which, as the stronghold of French Protestants, and also on account of its peculiar independent privileges, the French Court had long desired to subdue. The conduct of Charles, both towards his royal brother-in-law and the English Catholics, was vacillating, and when Buckingham's subsequent personal hostility to France brought about an alliance between the King of England and

¹ Lord Macaulay's 'Miscellaneous Writings,' 'Touching the Great Civil War,' i. 107.

² Hallam, 'Constitutional History,' i. 426.

³ Lingard, ix. 287, and note. Charles showed his attachment to his late favourite by paying his debts, and ordering his interment in Westminster Abbey, but, to prevent insults from the people, the road was carefully protected, and Buckingham's body was privately buried.

the Huguenots, it neither benefited the oppressed party in France, nor atoned in the view of the English nation for former lukewarmness or hostility.¹

In France, the Protestants had long formed a powerful political party. More than half a century before this time, notwithstanding their loss of power from the massacre of St. Bartholomew, La Rochelle had been able triumphantly to resist the siege laid to it by the Duke of Anjou. When, in 1627, Richelieu, the powerful minister of Louis XIII., made great preparations to reduce the devoted town, Charles was induced to propose himself as a mediator between the King of France and his Protestant subjects, and Buckingham sailed for Rochelle with a considerable fleet. The inhabitants were dismayed by the first appearance of the English armament, fearing that the duke intended to renew English domination in France. Buckingham's expedition proved a failure, but Charles promised further assistance, and Rochelle, tormented by famine, and suffering a siege of thirteen months' duration, implored England in June, 1628, for help. The direction of the expedition, which would have been commanded by Buckingham, was given to the Earl of Lindsay in September; but it arrived too late to save Rochelle, which had already surrendered at discretion. Charles felt himself disgraced by a surrender which might have been averted had his efforts in favour of the town been prompt and consistent.²

A large number of copies of the Petition of Right had been prepared for sale by the King's printers, when Charles ordered that they should be destroyed, in order that another edition might be substituted containing that evasive form of assent which the House had compelled him to cancel. Dishonourable to the sovereign, unworthy of an honest man, and sure of detection as was this proceeding, it still further imbued the people with indelible distrust of their king, who, in Mrs. Hutchinson's language, 'made no conscience of granting anything to the people, which he resolved should not oblige him longer than it served his turn, for he was a prince that had nothing of faith or truth, justice or generosity in him.'

Sir John Eliot was addressing the House of Commons on March 2, 1629, in vehement language with regard to the

¹ Hallam, i. 414. Lingard says that nothing can be collected from the correspondence of Charles with Buckingham relating to Rochelle, except that their alleged motive was not their chief reason for the enterprise.—Lingard, 268.

² Lingard, ix. 289; Michelet's 'Richelieu.'

despotism of the Government, when the Speaker interrupted him by moving an adjournment.

The patriot leaders, however, refused to separate without first making a protest against Popery and Arminianism, a doctrine opposed to Calvinism, and which increased the authority of bishops.¹ They also protested against the levying of tonnage and poundage, which they had made illegal. When, shortly afterwards, Parliament was dissolved, Sir John Eliot and some other members were sent to prison. Charles offered to liberate Eliot on bail, if he would apologise for his words; but when he refused to do this, the Court of King's Bench sentenced him to imprisonment during the king's pleasure, and fined him £2,000—a sum which was apparently beyond his power to pay. He was confined in a close dark room of the Tower, where he spent his time in study. His health suffered visibly, and he twice petitioned the king to grant him a respite in which to benefit by fresh air, promising to return again to prison. Charles refused, replying that Eliot's petitions were not sufficiently humble.² Distrustful of release, Eliot settled his estates in Cornwall in trust for his son whom he committed to the care of his friend Hampden. His health gradually sank under confinement until he died in November, 1632. It was in vain that his sons besought the king to allow his funeral to take place in Cornwall.

‘The dissolution of a Parliament,’ says Hallam, ‘was always to the Prerogative what the dispersion of clouds is to the sun. As if in mockery of the transient obstruction, it shone forth as splendid and scorching as before, and even after the exertions of the most popular and intrepid House of Commons that had ever met, Charles found himself in an instant unshackled by his law or his word.’ In direct violation of the Petition of Right, tonnage and poundage were again levied on the goods of merchants, and troops were billeted on the people.³

No minister who succeeded Buckingham had equal influence with the king, but Dr. Laud, Bishop of London, and Sir Thomas Wentworth, a former associate of Eliot and Hampden, who now accepted the office of President of the Council of the North, became the king's principal advisers. Laud had courted the favour of Buckingham and of both the late and present sovereigns. In 1633 he became Archbishop of Canterbury. An

¹ The theological distinction between Arminianism and Calvinism is explained in Hallam's ‘Literary History.’ The overruling idea of Predestination held by Calvin, abated confidence in episcopal direction.

² Sandford's ‘Great Rebellion,’ 158.

³ Hallam, i. 420–447.

intolerant persecutor of the Puritan clergy, Laud took a prominent part in directing the severities of the Star Chamber. Wentworth, better known by his later title of Earl of Strafford, went over to the Court, and became the most determined opponent of those liberties which he himself, when a member of the patriot party, had done his utmost to establish.¹ As a patriot, Wentworth had called Parliament 'the great physician.' The king was weary of resorting to a physician whose remedies were so repugnant to his temper; in Laud and Wentworth he now found willing supporters.

The Council of the North was instituted by Henry VIII. after that great insurrection called 'The Pilgrimage of Grace.' Under Wentworth's presidency it now exercised nearly despotic authority from the Tyne to the Humber.² Charles issued far more proclamations than his father had done, arbitrarily interfering with all the concerns of trade, fixing prices and restraining the importation of various articles. He now announced by proclamation that it was sheer presumption for any one to demand a Parliament, the right to assemble which depended entirely on the king's will. Before a Parliament could be thought of, the troublesome zeal for liberty must be quieted.³

But without a Parliament how could money be raised? When Henry III. and Edward I. summoned their military tenants to receive knighthood they fined those who failed to attend—a precedent which had been followed once by Elizabeth, and afterwards by James. Commissioners were now sent out to compound with those who had not appeared when summoned at the king's coronation, and some very large fines are said to have been exacted, probably from political animosity. Fearless of popular discontent, Charles attempted to revive in his own favour the ancient Forest Laws which had caused such complaint in former days, exacted money by renewing pretensions which had been long set aside, and inflicted enormous fines on those land-holders who, from possessing estates near to the royal forests, could be suspected of having trespassed on their limits. The Earl of Southampton was deprived of his estate near the New Forest and nearly ruined. Disregarding the past outcry against monopolies, the Government set up a

¹ See the characters of Laud and Wentworth drawn by Hallam, i. 457–461.

² Forster's 'Life of Strafford,' p. 247, and Hallam, i. 461, note. 'Wentworth' (in his correspondence) 'shows his abhorrence of liberty with all the bitterness of a renegade.'

³ Lingard gives the words of this proclamation, vol. ix. 295.

chartered company for making soap, with exclusive privileges.¹

London, in spite of the restrictions which King James had enforced, was extending on all sides. Charles sent commissioners to inflict penalties on the owners of the new houses. A Mr. Moor, who had erected forty-two houses in the neighbourhood of St. Martin-in-the-Fields, was condemned to pay a fine of £1,000; and, as he refused to demolish these houses, they were taken down by the sheriffs, who sold the materials to pay the fine.² In the year 1633 Charles revisited Scotland, which he had left in childhood, desiring to be crowned at Edinburgh. Accompanied by a train of English noblemen he proceeded in great state through England, and was received in Scotland with signs of joy and affection. But Laud went with the king, and at the coronation, which was performed by the Archbishop of St. Andrews, many spectators were annoyed by the introduction of ceremonies which the Scots considered as Popish superstition.

The coronation was succeeded by the meeting of the Scottish Parliament, which sat, as usual, only on two days, and had been carefully selected by the Chancellor.³ Liberal supplies were granted, objection being only made to the new regulations of clerical habits. But Charles sternly desired the members not to dispute his will, and pointing to the paper in his hand, exclaimed, 'Your names are here! I shall see who are willing to serve me.' The articles, including the objectionable innovations, which were, in fact, rejected by a majority, were re-affirmed, and when the Earl of Rothes ventured to state that the votes had been incorrectly reported, the king desired him not to arraign the testimony of the Lord Register. By such conduct the affection with which Charles had been at first regarded was quickly changed to mistrust; but an act of more signal tyranny occurred soon after his departure. A petition had been prepared by some of the Scottish Lords for presentation to the king, deprecating, in temperate and submissive terms, those articles of which they disapproved, but, the royal displeasure being but too apparent, it had been afterwards set aside. A copy of this discarded paper was found in possession of Lord Balmerino, whose father had been in disgrace in the last reign, and whose name was already in the king's list of the disaffected. The Archbishop of St. Andrews hastened to Court to urge that a severe example should be made of this nobleman;

¹ Hallam, i. 430.

² Lingard, ix. 304, note.

³ Laing's 'History of Scotland,' iii. 110.

and Balmerino was tried on the charge, known only in Scotland, of leasing-making, according to which it was not only a capital offence to utter untrue or slanderous speeches concerning the sovereign, but to have listened to such addresses without reporting them to the Government; even the seeking to suppress them exposed the hearers to the same punishment. Such latitude of interpretation, as Hallam observes, was 'never found in England, even in the worst times of Henry VIII.'¹ In this way a petition couched in the most inoffensive terms, and which had not been delivered, was set forth in the indictment as a dangerous libel, and a majority of eight jurors against seven, convicted Balmerino of having forborne to reveal the author of a seditious paper. The jury had been chosen with gross partiality, and in Scotland a simple majority was sufficient. So strong was the indignation of the people that they threatened in case of Balmerino's execution, to revenge his death on the eight jurors by whom he was convicted, and on their foreman, Lord Traquair.² Although sentence of death was pronounced, the Lord Treasurer, fearing violence, procured a respite under the king's pleasure, and a pardon was ungraciously yielded by Charles. Scotland could not forget this extreme stretch of power, and Balmerino's name appeared, shortly after, among the strenuous opponents of the royal authority.

In England, meantime, every expedient had been tried for dispensing with a Parliament, when Attorney-General Noy suggested an ingenious device, the renewal of the claim of ship-money. When ransacking the financial schemes of past times, Noy had discovered that the seaports and maritime counties had been formerly required to furnish ships for the public service. More ships were now required; pirates from Algiers had ventured to infest the Channel, and it was doubtful whether the commercial jealousy of England and Holland would not soon come to an open rupture. The antipathy with which Charles regarded all republican or Calvinist institutions inspired him with an aversion to Holland, although he afterwards convinced himself that peace abroad would the better secure his sovereignty at home. It was in October, 1634, that the Council issued the first writ to the magistrates of London and other seaports, setting forth the necessity of preparing a defence, and enjoining those ports to provide a certain number of ships of war and to furnish a contribution by general assessment.

¹ 'Constitutional History,' ii. 485.

² Laing's 'History of Scotland,' iii. 120.

The citizens of London pleaded their privileges, secured by charter, but were compelled to submit, and the murmurs of inferior towns were still more easily suppressed. The apparent success of the scheme caused its extension to inland counties; the sheriffs were directed to assess all persons according to their means, and to enforce payment by distress.

Many even of the Court party were alarmed by this extraordinary demand; but punishment was so promptly inflicted upon recusants that the majority submitted in silence. It was, however, considered prudent by the Government to consult the twelve judges concerning the legality of the measure. At the king's command, they declared their unanimous opinion that 'when the good and safety of the kingdom is concerned, and the whole kingdom in danger, his Majesty might, by writ under the Great Seal, command all his subjects to furnish the means of defence, might compel them so to do, and that he was the sole judge both of the danger and of the means by which it could be prevented.' This decision of the judges was read publicly by the Lord Mayor in the Star Chamber, but did not prevent a few intrepid persons from determining that 'the liberties of their country might at least not perish silently.'¹ The first person who resisted in Court was Richard Chambers, who brought an action against the Lord Mayor for having thrown him into prison; but Judge Berkley would not suffer counsel to plead against the legality of the tax, and made out 'a rule of government,' distinct from 'the rule of law.' Next came the cases of Lord Say and Mr. Hampden.

It has caused much surprise in the present age to find, by the parish returns, that Hampden, a gentleman of good estate in Buckinghamshire, was rated for his land in one parish but £1 11s. 6d. and for that in another £1. It was on account of the smaller sum that the suit was tried in the Court of Exchequer, before all the judges. 'The whole kingdom,' says Hume, 'was attentive to the issue of a cause which was of much greater consequence than the event of many battles.' The tax which was resisted by Hampden, who had been esteemed a quiet, courteous gentleman, the last to oppose the law,² was not only objectionable in principle, but was in fact extremely oppressive. In one year it cost the City of London £35,000, some individuals contributing as much as £300.

Sir John Colepepper declared in Parliament that the tax of ship-money 'made the farmers faint, and made the plough go

¹ Hallam, i. 435-436, and notes.

² Lingard, ix. 333.

heavy.’¹ The Crown lawyers urged the practice of the Anglo-Saxon kings of raising money, called Dane-gelt, for the defence of the kingdom ; to this it was replied, that even Dane-gelt had not been paid by the inland counties, and that it had been declared by Magna Charta, and by the lately-granted Petition of Right, that no tax could be raised by the royal prerogative alone. No urgent necessity now existed, and the plea of ill-defended fisheries was nothing but a pretence for raising money to support the king’s despotic authority.

Six months elapsed before the final judgment was given—a delay which proved injurious to the Crown ; a bare majority of the judges decided in favour of the Government, three, for technical reasons, refusing to concur. Two judges, Croke and Hutton, men of reputation and experience, ventured to oppose this use of the prerogative, and apologised for having previously concurred in an opposite decision.² The verdict was, however, hailed by the Court as an important victory, although, as Lord Clarendon afterwards allowed, it proved ‘of more advantage to the gentlemen condemned.’ When the first decision of the judges in favour of ship-money was announced, Lord Wentworth triumphantly declared that, by giving the power of raising an army, the decision would make the king ‘absolute at home and formidable abroad. Let him only abstain from war for a few years, that he may habituate his subjects to this payment, and he will find himself more powerful than any of his predecessors.’³ Inspired by Laud, the Court of Star Chamber now became more oppressive than ever ; those who inflicted the punishments reaped the profits, and, ‘like famished birds of prey, were eager to supply for a moment, by some wretch’s ruin, the craving emptiness of the exchequer.’⁴ Sir Richard Grenville, having engaged in a lawsuit with the Earl of Suffolk, was accused before the Star Chamber of having called the earl a base lord ; and for that slight offence, although insufficiently proved, was condemned to pay a fine of £8,000, which was divided between the earl and the king. A waterman in the service of a man of quality, when squabbling with a citizen about his fare, displayed his badge, a swan, which was his master’s crest. The citizen having carelessly said that he did not trouble his head ‘about that goose,’ was summoned before the Court for these idle words, and so severely fined that he was reduced to beggary, the Court being thus continually employed to gratify personal malignity.

¹ Forster’s *Essay ‘On the Grand Remonstrance,’* p. 44. ² Hallam, i. 448–453.

³ ‘*Strafford Papers.*’ See Lingard, ix. 333.

⁴ Hallam.

Dr. Williams, Bishop of Lincoln, a man of learning, Bacon's successor as Lord Keeper, aroused the archbishop's anger by his kindness towards Puritans. He was fined £10,000, sentenced to be suspended from his office, and imprisoned during the king's pleasure. The officers who were sent to the episcopal palace at Lincoln unfortunately found letters from a schoolmaster, named Osbaldiston, addressed to the bishop, in which were some words of contumely, believed to apply to Laud. Accordingly, for the alleged offence of having received scandalous letters, Williams was again tried and condemned to pay a further sum of £8,000, £3,000 of which were assigned as damages to the archbishop. The schoolmaster, who was sentenced to pay £5,000 and lose his ears, fortunately saved himself by flight.¹ While judicial greed stimulated the persecution of the rich, the Puritan poor were exposed to whipping, the pillory, the loss of their ears, and long imprisonment. Laud's diary of 1630 particularises the tortures which he inflicted on a minister named Leighton (the father of a bishop), who had published a violent book against the Court and the heads of the Church. When, after ten years' incarceration, the 'Long Parliament' ordered Leighton's release, he had lost his sight, his hearing, and the use of his limbs. Another victim of Laud's cruelty was William Prynne, a barrister of Lincoln's Inn, of strict Puritan opinions, who had written a large book, severely condemning the amusements in which the queen took pleasure, the country sports held round the may-pole, and also the rich robes and ceremonial observances in which the Anglican resembled the Roman Catholic Church. Laud showed the king these passages, and Prynne was consequently sentenced to be expelled from his profession, to stand twice in the pillory, losing an ear in each place, to see his book burnt by the public executioner, to pay a fine of £5,000, and to suffer imprisonment for life. Prynne had been unwilling personally to stigmatise the king and queen, but after he was thrown into prison he wrote the most severe invectives against the bishops. Dr. Bastwick, a physician, and Henry Burton, a suspended clergyman, likewise followed his example. Stung by their invectives, Laud again brought Prynne before the Star Chamber with his coadjutors, and again the barbarous punishment of the pillory was inflicted. Laud determined to withdraw these obstinate martyrs from public attention by sending them to prisons in distant counties, but when they left London the number of friends who came forth to testify their sympathy gave their departure the appearance

¹ See the 52nd chapter of 'Hume's History'; Lingard, ix. 320; Hallam, i. 454.

of a triumphal procession. Fines were exacted from those who thus dared to fraternise with culprits, and the three prisoners were sent out of England to Jersey, Guernsey and Scilly.

During the last two reigns numerous artisans who had been driven from their homes in France, Holland and Germany, by religious persecution, had obtained a settlement in England, where they enjoyed the free exercise of their forms of worship. But the oppressive hand of power was now raised against these industrious refugees. Laud required that all who were born in England should conform to the worship of their parish church. The congregations expostulated, and the neighbouring residents pleaded, but in vain, the loss which the community would suffer if these artisans were no longer protected. Laud was inflexible, and several flourishing manufacturing colonies in Kent, Norfolk, and other counties were totally ruined.¹

It was now the turn of Englishmen to look elsewhere for that refuge which their own country denied them. The first English settlers in Massachusetts landed in December, 1620. In 1629, Charles granted to intending emigrants a charter for that province; about three hundred and fifty persons sailed, and gave to their new settlement in the American wilds the name of New England. Men of a higher class in society than the first colonists, who had become hopeless of the state of affairs in England, were preparing to emigrate, when Laud 'for his own and his master's curse,' procured an order from the Council to stop their departure.²

A proclamation dated May 1, 1638, after stating that many persons went yearly to New England in order to be out of the reach of ecclesiastical authority, commanded that no one should be allowed to pass without a licence, and a testimonial of conformity from the minister of his parish. Persecuted at home, yet forbidden to depart, where could the conscientious Puritan find a refuge?³ A clergyman of Gloucester named Workman had inveighed against the Popish ornaments in the churches, and for this he was sent to prison. The city of Gloucester granted him a pension of £20 per annum, but the pension was declared void, and the mayor and others were condemned to pay a fine for having dared to grant it.

Some matters which to most men may now appear of little

¹ Masson's 'Life of Milton,' i. 629.

² Hallam, i. 476.

³ It has been stated by some writers that Hampden and Cromwell were among the intending emigrants, but although they, without doubt, looked with great interest on the rising settlement of New England, it has not been proved that they were really wishing to embark. Forster's 'Life of Pym,' vol. iii. of 'Lives of British Statesmen.'

consequence were in this age viewed as of the greatest. James, disliking the rigidity of Puritanism, had published a 'Book of Sports,' to encourage Sunday amusement.

In the spring of 1632, two Puritan judges at the Somersetshire assizes published an order, to be read by all parish clergymen, forbidding wakes and other amusements which were at that time usual on Sunday. Complaint of this having been laid before the king, he sent his father's 'Book of Sports' to be read in opposition. The reading of the king's book was enforced with tyrannical severity, and thirty clergymen in one single diocese who refused to read it were expelled from the pale of the Church. 'Mankind,' says Hallam, 'love sport as little as prayer by compulsion, and the effect of the king's declaration was to produce a far more scrupulous abstinence from diversions on Sundays than had been practised before.'¹ The homes opening in the New World, and the vessels sailing thither, would not have nearly contained all the English recusants. The number of sectaries increased daily, the fervour of their zeal apparently stimulated by persecution.

In the obscure cellars of towns, in barns and retired woods in the country, men assembled to pray and preach, joining with their religious exercises fierce invectives against the Government.

Laud next attempted to interfere with the Puritan congregations founded by English and Scottish emigrants in the Low Countries; but these were under protection of the Dutch law, and their publications even penetrated to England.

Lord Wentworth, the President of the Northern Council, was transferred in 1633 to a position of wider range—that of Lord Deputy of Ireland, where he found abundant scope for his commanding energy. His measures alike repressed subordinate tyranny, and thoroughly established his own.² The great difficulty there, as well as in England, was to raise money without granting concessions. Charles had promised indulgences to the Catholics which the Protestants disapproved, and which Wentworth determined to cancel. He obtained large subsidies from the Irish Parliament, and, by urging a fictitious claim that the whole province of Connaught belonged to the king by inheritance, induced many freeholders to surrender their lands. Yet Wentworth was not so far engrossed with the concerns of Ireland as to be unmindful of England. He regularly corresponded with Laud, and the word 'Thorough,' by which they encouraged each other in their efforts for the complete

¹ Hallam, i. 474-476.

² Ib. 462.

establishment of despotism, has been applied by historians to their policy. Exulting in their success, Wentworth exclaimed, 'Now I can say that the king is as absolute *here* (in Ireland) as any prince in the world can be, if it be not spoiled on that side.' Yet, still unsatisfied, they aimed at further consolidation of authority, the subject of an earnest correspondence still extant. They thought the progress of the Government cautious and slow, and that the punishments for libel ought to be of quicker operation.¹ They murmured against the lawyers who presumed to interpose with difficulties, and Strafford expressed his wish that 'Mr. Hampden and others to his likeness were well whipped into their right senses; if that the rod be so used as that it smarts not, I am the more sorry.'

A signal instance of Wentworth's arrogance excited great resentment.

The Lord Mountnorris, a captain in the Irish army, had made use of some slight expressions of ill-will, for which Wentworth caused him to be tried by a court martial on a charge of mutiny, and himself pronounced on him sentence of death. It appears not to have been the Lord Deputy's intention to execute this judgment, but to humiliate and persecute Mountnorris; and this act of oppression added so greatly to the general hatred with which Wentworth was regarded, that he came to England to vindicate his conduct before the king and Council. Having explained his course of administration, he received the royal applause for his vigour and ability, and returned to Ireland in triumph.²

Episcopal jurisdiction had been established in Scotland, but the Scottish bishops, being subject to a Presbyterian Assembly, were not recognised as such by English Churchmen. In their eyes the whole form of religion was wanting; there was no liturgy; the bishops were bishops but in name; 'the beauty of holiness' was absent.³

Archbishop Laud had reluctantly conceded to the Scottish bishops the task of preparing a new service-book for Scotland. In the main it was an adaptation from the English liturgy, and, after completion and revision by himself and two other bishops, was to be imposed on the Scotch by royal authority. General Assemblies were henceforth declared illegal, unless convened by the king's will, and private meetings for the exposition of Scripture were prohibited. The service-book was to be in future

¹ Hallam, i. 463-468; Lingard, ix. 340-343.

² Lingard, ix. 314; Hallam, i. 463. Mountnorris was sentenced in December 1635.

³ Masson's 'Milton,' p. 375, with a quotation from Clarendon's 'History of the Rebellion,' i. 63.

the only directory of devotion; no one was to receive the Sacrament except on the knees, and other injunctions were issued respecting fasts, communion-tables, and the practice of confession, utterly repugnant to the nation, which viewed them as sinful relics of Popery. When the long-deferred service-book came forth, all parish ministers in Scotland were desired to furnish themselves with two copies of it; and it was announced that it would be introduced on Sunday, July 23, before the Lords of Session dispersed for their vacation. On the appointed day, the Bishop and Dean of Edinburgh, with the lords, judges, and magistrates, proceeded in form to the High Church, which was for the future to be called 'the Cathedral.' The church was crowded with women, who interrupted the service with groans and hisses, and Janet Geddes, one of the number, infuriated at the innovations, hurled her stool at the officiating dean, after which so many missiles followed that the clergy were glad to escape in a nobleman's carriage. Nor was resistance to the royal commands confined to the lower ranks. The English Parliament had protested some years previously against Arminianism, but in Scotland Calvinism, apart from the dictation of the monarch or of bishops appointed by him, was a leading principle, animating men of all ranks, and cherished as life itself. By this interference with their mode of worship, Charles at once dissipated the willing loyalty of his countrymen, and brought to his discontented English subjects powerful allies. Edinburgh was soon filled to overflowing with men from all parts of Scotland, landholders, peasants, artisans, all coming forth to protest against the innovations which only three Scottish bishops had ventured to adopt.¹ Thirty-eight noblemen, gentlemen without number, and all the towns excepting Aberdeen, joined in this protest. Charles replied to these appeals in December, 1637, by insisting still more stringently on the adoption of the liturgy, and by declaring it treason to assemble and petition against it.

He little calculated the strength of opposition which he thus evoked. The Scottish people had already on some important occasions bound themselves by a covenant. The 'Solemn League and Covenant' which was now instituted was the work of Alexander Henderson, a leader in their Church, and of Archibald Johnston, Lord Warriston, an eminent lawyer, and was approved by Lords Balmerino, Loudon and Rothes. It contained a profession of Calvinistic Protestantism, a disclaimer

¹ The Government 'were put to shifts to get ministers to read it.'—Masson's 'Milton,' i. 675.

of all innovations, and a pledge to defend the king, the religion, the laws, and freedom of the country from all dangers. It was received with transport by a united people; swift messengers carried the important paper to the most distant regions; men of all ranks, even women and children, in their markets or churches, pledged themselves to its observance, and in less than six weeks all Scotland had confederated to obey this as their national law.

It was on February 28, 1638, that the Covenant was first received at the church of the Grey Friars at Edinburgh, and the flat gravestone is still preserved on which were inscribed the names of the men and women who crowded thither.¹ There, after a religious service conducted by Henderson, and an address from Lord Loudon, the congregation rose, and all, with outstretched arms, pledged themselves in the words of the Covenant. Nearly all the nobles in Scotland, excepting those of the Privy Council, were among the subscribers. The signing of the Covenant became the text for all pulpits, and in some cases whole congregations stood up together to testify their concurrence.

Charles now determined to suppress these remonstrants by open force, but whilst preparing for the contest he sent the Marquis of Hamilton to Scotland to try the effect of negotiation. Hamilton invited the Scottish nobility to meet him at Haddington, but the Covenanters did not attend. When he reached Edinburgh he found them in strength; many thousands, in fact, appeared in close array, headed by about five hundred ministers, who, under pretence of showing respect to the royal commissioner, took the occasion of displaying their numbers. The marquis felt so strongly the difficulty of conciliating the parties, that he made two journeys to London to consult the king, and on his second return published concessions which would at an earlier time have been gratefully accepted. Charles offered to recall the obnoxious service-book, and to dispense with Church usages introduced by his father in 1617, but he required all persons to abandon the new Covenant, and in its place to subscribe James's formal declaration against Popery, published at the time when England was threatened by Spain, when any alliance with the Roman Catholic party would have endangered the Stuart succession to the throne of Elizabeth. But the Scottish leaders distrusted the friendliness of the king's intentions, and they were right. 'Your chief end being now to win time that they may commit public follies, until I be ready to suppress them,' are the king's significant words to his minister, Hamilton. The

¹ See Dean Stanley's 'Lectures on the Church of Scotland.'

Scottish leaders persisted in their union, and published a formal protest in reply.¹

The Marquis of Hamilton left Scotland with much grief at the utter failure of his efforts, while the Scots at the end of the year celebrated a day of national thanksgiving for their delivery from Popery and Prelacy. Having taken their stand, they were aware that they must prepare for war. Every man capable of bearing arms was regularly trained, even Scottish officers who were actually serving in the Swedish and Dutch armies returned to assist their countrymen. One of these, indeed, Alexander Lesley, had risen in the Swedish service to the rank of field-marshal. In both countries money was the great want, but many of the nobility sent their plate to be coined, and a liberal present was sent by Richelieu in the name of the French king, in retaliation for the part which Charles had taken in assisting the insurgents at Rochelle. Religious differences often yield to political exigencies or revenge. But the present was concealed from the Covenanters, who would have thought it a crime to receive it.²

The king's coffers were nearly empty, and Lord Northumberland wrote to Wentworth in distress, to consult how the means of carrying on a war could be found without the dreaded intervention of Parliament.³ Even Wentworth 'stood appalled at the perils of his sovereign and his own,' and now dissuaded Charles from war with Scotland. But Charles was bent on war. The queen employed her influence with the Catholic gentry, who promptly offered large contributions, and in some cases their personal service. There was a project of procuring 10,000 regular troops from Flanders, in exchange for a force to be sent to Spain from England and Ireland. Colonel Gage, a Roman Catholic officer, who negotiated this treaty, declared that with such an army, the king might both subdue the Scots, hold his Parliament in check, and make them comply with his conditions. The treaty, however, failed of execution, from some demur on the side of Spain. It was extremely difficult to raise money for a war so unpopular with large classes of the English people. The citizens of London, when pressed for a loan, used as much evasion as they dared. Ship-

¹ Lingard, ix. 356, note. The quotation is from Burnet's 'Hamiltons.' Guizot gives a letter from Charles to Hamilton which is of the same tenor, 'Pièces Historiques,' i. 384.

² Lingard, ix. 360.

³ Hallam, i. 502, and see, in the note to p. 504, his contradiction of the statement of the royal finances given by Hume and Clarendon. Lord Northumberland said that there was only £200 in the exchequer.

money was refused in several counties, Charles was even disappointed with the temper of the peers. He had reached York in April, 1639, where he had convened noblemen to meet him with their attendant retinues, and proposed to the lords an oath of allegiance, binding them to oppose all seditions, conspiracies, and covenants against his person and dignity, even 'if they come veiled under the pretence of religion.' But Lords Brooke and Say refused to take this oath, declaring that they were ready through affection to accompany their king, but that they were unable to decide whether the Covenanters were rebels, or the war against them just. Charles ordered their arrest, and was much disappointed to find, on consulting his law advisers, that it was needful to discharge them without punishment. Meantime on the side of the Scots there was no failing either of numbers or of enthusiasm in the cause.

The Castles of Edinburgh, Dumbarton and Stirling were already in the hands of the Covenanters, so were the regalia of Scotland, and every day brought to Charles intelligence of some new loss or peril. From York the king proceeded to Berwick. Lesley, the Scottish commander, at the head of more than 20,000 men, threatened to attack, when the king took alarm, and signified his willingness to negotiate. By the terms of the 'Pacification of Berwick,' in adjusting which Charles took the principal part, it was agreed to refer all ecclesiastical questions to a General Assembly, and all civil matters to a Parliament, both of which were to be convened for the ensuing August. Before Charles returned to London he gave Traquair authority to preside in both these Assemblies, and to consent in his name to abolish episcopacy, the service-book, and the other articles to which the Scottish people were averse. For the present he was willing to tolerate what he had not the power to prevent; he intended to revoke whatever he might now grant through his exigency.¹ The Covenanters were, however, determined to retain every advantage, and the language afterwards used in both assemblies strengthened the king's determination to have recourse to force in re-establishing his authority. He instructed his Council to provide funds, and prepare for a campaign in Scotland. They issued writs for ship-money to the amount of £200,000, but advised that a Parliament should be called; 'and if,' said Charles, 'this Parliament should prove as untoward as some have lately been, will you assist me in such extraordinary ways as in that extremity

¹ Lingard, ix. 367.

should be thought fit?' They promised compliance. Wentworth assured the king that he held the Irish Parliament in complete subjection; he subscribed £20,000 to the king's expenses, was created Earl of Strafford and Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, and gave orders for the immediate levy in Ireland of 8,000 men. Charles alone had, in Hallam's view, taken the resolution of superseding for ever the legal Constitution of England. The judges, the peers, Lord Strafford, even Laud, knew that government by proclamations and subsidies by writs could not, and ought not, to be permanent in England. 'All mention of calling a Parliament grated on the king's ear.'¹

Serious men had, in the words of a historian of the time, long 'groaned for a Parliament,' and the country received the news of its assembling with joy and hope. The leaders of the patriot party were Hampden and Pym. Hampden had acquired great popularity by his spirited resistance to the exaction of ship-money. He now removed his family to London from his residence in Buckinghamshire, for which he was a member, and devoted himself entirely to public affairs.

To excite the anger of Parliament against the Scots, Charles displayed before them an intercepted letter, in which the leaders of the Covenanters had besought aid from the King of France. But the attention of the House of Commons was engrossed by the grievances from which the country had lately been suffering, and which Pym urged upon the members in an ever memorable speech, greatly contributing to the general enthusiasm. He principally complained of innovations in religion, invasions of private property, and breaches of parliamentary privilege, and for the redress of these grievances, the Commons asked the co-operation of the Upper House. Charles hoped to bribe them into a more favourable mood. He sent a message to the House of Commons on May 4, promising that if twelve subsidies were granted him immediately—or, in fact, £850,000, to be paid in three years—he would consent to give up ship-money for ever! The offer was tempting to some of the members, but the patriot leaders understood too well what in such case would next ensue. They knew that, if this money were granted, the king would have an army sufficient not only to repress the Scottish Covenanters, but to withstand all their efforts in favour of reform. After a debate of nine hours, the House adjourned, and next day, before they could come to a vote on the question, the king, who had been informed of their temper, abruptly

¹ Hallam, i. 505.

dissolved Parliament. The session had lasted only three weeks. It was now evident, even to the most loyally disposed, that Charles would not endure any Parliament which was not subservient to his will, and that England was in danger of being reduced to the state of France and Spain, where the old free assemblies had shrunk down to be mere formal registries of despotic acts. Had Charles waited a day longer, a positive refusal of his terms would, in the opinion of many, have justified the dissolution. The people, unwilling to look upon the king himself as the enemy of liberty, ascribed the guilt of the dissolution to Strafford and Laud. Handbills were circulated calling on the London apprentices to meet in St. George's Fields and hunt 'William the Fox, the breaker of the Parliament,' and a large body of rioters attempted to gain entrance into the archbishop's palace at Lambeth, but were repulsed. Lord Northumberland, at that time a courtier, wrote that it was 'impossible for things to continue long' as they then were. 'So general a defection in this kingdom hath not been known in the memory of any.' The king removed the queen to Greenwich for safety, and anxiously awaited the arrival of troops. After disorders which lasted several days, the presence of a large force restored order in London. Two of the rioters suffered death, after being subjected to torture, still refusing to disclose the names of those with whom they acted.¹

The urgency of the crisis, instead of leading the king to adopt more prudent measures, excited him and his advisers to further acts of oppression. Some of the leading members of the House of Commons were arrested, and their houses searched for papers. Ship-money was enforced with greater rigour than before, and several sheriffs and the Lord Mayor of London were prosecuted in the Star Chamber for neglecting to levy it. Some gentlemen of Yorkshire having refused to pay an arbitrary loan, Strafford advised that they should be brought to London in irons.² Mr. Crewe, the chairman of the 'Committee for Religion,' was thrown into the Tower for refusing to surrender some parliamentary petitions which had been entrusted to him, the disclosure of which would have exposed many of the clergy to the vengeance of Laud. The king issued a declaration giving reasons for the dissolution, and charged Pym and his friends with audacious interference with the acts of Government, 'as if kings were bound to give an account of their regal actions, and of their manner of government, to their subjects assembled

¹ May, 1640. Lingard, ix. 376; Hallam, i. 510.

² Guizot quotes 'Strafford's Letters,' i. 140.

in Parliament.’¹ The Scots again took advantage of the king’s difficulties, and resolved, after the dissolution of the English Parliament, to attempt the redress of their grievances by arms. When, on August 20, General Lesley crossed the English border at the head of 26,000 men, the Scots published a declaration affirming that their quarrel was not with the English people but with the prelatical government alone. As soon as they arrived upon English ground the ministers of religion were placed in the foremost rank, as a token of their pacific intentions, and the soldiers held their arms reversed. To oppose this incursion, the king now found it difficult to raise either money or troops. Loans were generally refused by the citizens, and even the gentry were mostly slow to contribute to the cost of an unpopular war, which they attributed to the king’s impolicy. Some supply was, however, raised for the service by contributions from the clergy and Roman Catholics. The troops who were opposed to the Scots were nearly all disaffected, and suspected their officers of Popery; some even mutinied. Newcastle and other principal towns in the North quickly fell into the hands of the Covenanters, and when Strafford joined the army as commander-in-chief, intending to re-organise it, he found that the king had been already persuaded to negotiate. So disaffected and undisciplined, in fact, was the English army that even Strafford, ‘though passionately against a treaty, did not venture to advise an engagement.’² Under these difficulties, Charles ‘adopted the hopeless scheme of convening a great Council of all the peers at York, as the only alternative, save that of summoning a Parliament.’ It was an expedient, however, which had not been practised for centuries. But the peers were more sensible than their king of the evils of violating the Constitution. Twelve noblemen presented a petition pointing out that a Parliament was the necessary resource; and another to the same effect was signed by 10,000 London citizens. At length Charles yielded, and announced his intention of summoning a new Parliament to meet on November 3; upon which Strafford, dissatisfied, and out of health, begged to be allowed to retire to his government of Ireland; but Charles refused his request, pledging himself that ‘while there was a king in England, not a hair of Strafford’s head should be touched by the Parliament.’³

In reply to the serious question how the army of the Scottish Covenanters should be dealt with, the Council sent sixteen

¹ Sandford, p. 169; Hallam, i. 509–533.

² Hallam, i. 511.

³ Sandford, p. 170.

peers to Ripon to negotiate with the eight commissioners appointed by the Scots. These sixteen peers were of the popular party, and some of them had the previous year become acquainted with those Scottish commissioners who came to London, and whom Charles had sent to the Tower on a charge of treasonable correspondence with the King of France. To the great surprise of the other peers, it was revealed by the Scots that Lord Savile, who was then at Ripon, and had conferred confidentially with Lord Loudon when he was a prisoner, had sent to him in Scotland an invitation to bring the Scottish army into England, adding the forged signatures of six Liberal peers, without which encouragement the Covenanters would not have hazarded their invasion. Although the peers whose names had thus been counterfeited reprehended the false conduct of Lord Savile, there appears to have been a general wish to seize the opportunity for the redress of the grievances of both kingdoms. If the Scots remained in England, they must be maintained. They had raised £5,600 from the inhabitants of Northumberland and Durham, and the gentlemen of the four Northern counties offered to supply this sum to them from the county rates, on a solemn promise that Parliament would reimburse them. The treaty was immediately transferred to London, whither the king hastened to prepare for the opening of Parliament, followed by the Scottish commissioners. The king's position was inglorious in the extreme; his subjects were taxing themselves for the maintenance of invaders whom he had failed to eject; but 'in this alarming posture of his affairs Charles had no resource but the dishonourable pacification of Ripon.'¹ Before the general election took place, Hampden and Pym rode through several counties, exhorting the people to give their votes to men worthy of confidence. The occasion was indeed momentous, and well did the country answer to the call. The chosen representatives, nearly five hundred in number, included all the men of any eminence in the popular or Puritan party, and were 'not the demagogues or adventurers of transient popularity, but men well-born and wealthy, than whom there could perhaps never be assembled five hundred more adequate to redress the grievances, or to fix the laws of a great nation.'²

The House of Lords consisted of one hundred and twenty-

¹ Hallam, i. 511. Hallam speaks of 'the well-known story of Lord Savile's forged letter,' for which he quotes evidence, and which has been further confirmed by more recent evidence afforded by a MS. in the British Museum. See Sandford's 'Great Rebellion,' p. 170.

² Hallam, i. 522.

three temporal peers, two archbishops, and twenty-four bishops. Of the temporal peers, two-thirds had been enrolled within the last thirty-seven years by Stuart kings, having acquired their rank either by purchase or in requital of unscrupulous assistance to the crown.

There were Puritans also in the House of Lords, although a minority. Francis Russell, Earl of Bedford, and Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex, were Puritans.¹ The greater number and important connexions of the Commons gave them great influence with the Lords, with whom they had frequent conferences, and who rarely, except in defence of the order of bishops, opposed their resolutions.

November 3, the day on which that assembly met which was afterwards designated as the 'Long Parliament,' was noted for its gloom. Charles did not ride as usual in state to Westminster, but went privately in his barge, more as if to an adjourned Parliament than to one newly chosen. 'The eyes of all men,' says Lord Clarendon, 'were fixed upon Hampden as the pilot that must steer the vessel through the tempests and rocks that threatened it. His power and interest were greater to do good or hurt than any man's in the kingdom, for his reputation of honesty was universal; and his affections seemed so publicly guided that no corrupt or private ends could bias them.' Never had Parliament been at the first so numerously attended, and never before had the members looked so defiantly on their sovereign as now. The court had, during 'the long vacancy of Parliaments,' encouraged extravagance of dress; and the splendour of the revels and pastimes held under court patronage 'might,' says a contemporary writer, 'have led any stranger to believe that a kingdom that looked so cheerfully in the face could not be sick in any part.'²

The stricter manners and greater gravity of the reformers, who for the most part belonged to the Puritan section, were apparent in their outward garb; and from their usual custom of cutting the hair close, as it is worn at present, instead of the long flowing locks worn by the Court or Cavalier party, the reformers acquired the name of 'Roundheads.'³ It was immediately apparent that the Parliament had assembled for serious business, 'the removing all grievances and pulling up

¹ Hallam, i. 521. Sandford, 285.

² May's 'History of the Long Parliament.' See Sandford's 'Studies of the Great Rebellion,' p. 162.

³ It is observed by Mr. Sandford that it is too frequently forgotten that the great majority of the English Puritans had not separated from the Established Church, but formed a party *within* it (p. 89).

the causes of them by the roots.'¹ On the very first day of debate, November 6, Pym moved for a committee of the whole House to consider the state of Ireland, where great oppression had been practised; after a long debate, the friends of the Earl of Strafford voting for a *select* committee, the motion was granted by a majority of thirteen votes.

Strafford was immediately apprised of the danger which threatened him, and advised to consult his safety by remaining at York with the army. If he did incline to come up, he might do well to impeach those members who were suspected of having induced the Scottish army to enter England. Charles eagerly desired his presence; and the earl, relying on the king's support, and on his intended impeachment of the opposition leaders of both Houses, arrived in London on the 10th, being received by the king with renewed assurances of protection.

A mortal combat was approaching between the lord-lieutenant, backed by the king's favour, and a determined and indignant House of Commons, and no time was lost on either side. On November 11, Strafford took his seat in the House of Lords, where he was received with due respect as the king's first minister. A message from the Lords requested the presence of the House of Commons that afternoon at three o'clock, as the king desired an account of the conferences at Ripon and York. The Commons, who were deeply engaged in discussion, excused themselves from attendance, but appointed a committee to draw up their charge against the earl. Their report was speedily prepared, and by a unanimous vote Pym was deputed to proceed immediately to the House of Lords to accuse the lord-lieutenant of Ireland of high treason. It was on the afternoon of this eventful day, between four and five o'clock, that Pym, followed by upwards of three hundred members, and in full sight of an assembled crowd, delivered this momentous message 'in the name of all the Commons of England,' expressing their desire that the earl might be 'forthwith committed to prison.'

Strafford, then with the king at Whitehall, received immediate information of this proceeding, his informant adding the friendly inquiry what was to be the next step. The earl, with his usual high spirit, resolved to meet his accusers, and at once returned to the House, but was detained in the lobby until the Lords had agreed on their course. As soon as admitted, he

¹ The words used by Pym, in conversing with Mr. Hyde (Clarendon), a few days before Parliament met, 'with much other sharp discourse.'—Sandford's 'Studies of the Great Rebellion,' p. 297.

was commanded to kneel at the bar to hear from the lord keeper the charge preferred against him, and was then committed to the care of the gentleman-usher. After remaining at his house for a few days, he was sent to the Tower, bail having been refused him. Thus suddenly was that proud earl surrendered for trial, 'before whom that morning the greatest of England would have stood uncovered.' From that hour the Parliament had virtually triumphed, and the king already confessed in word and deed alike the extent of the power and the magnitude of the contest which he was now destined to encounter.¹

During the time spent in preparing the articles of impeachment, numerous important measures were passed in rapid succession. Only a year before, Charles had seemed to enjoy an almost absolute power; and now every branch of his usurped prerogative trembled in the grasp of 'these terrible reformers,' as Lord Clarendon calls them.² By warrant of the House, Prynne, Burton, Leighton, and other victims of Star Chamber tyranny, were released from prison, and entered London on different days in triumphal procession, attended by many carriages and horsemen, and by a multitude wearing bay and rosemary in their hats. Their sentences were reversed by vote of the House, and damages were awarded them against their judges. The lord keeper Finch, who had been zealous in levying ship-money, and Secretary Windebank, who was instrumental in the dissolution of the last Parliament, fled to the Continent to avoid impeachment.

A petition was presented, signed by 15,000 citizens of London, that bishops might no longer have power in the State. Charges were brought against Archbishop Laud for his late conduct in support of tyranny, and, on December 18, Denzil Holles was sent to the bar of the House of Lords to prefer against him the charge of high treason.

The archbishop rose with great indignation to repel the accusation, but was silenced and placed in custody. Six weeks afterwards he was committed to the Tower. The long and bitter experience of the interval of eleven years, during which Charles had governed without a Parliament, impelled the reformers to take prompt measures for the prevention of such an abuse of power for the future. A statute of Edward III. provided that Parliament should meet every year, 'oftener if need be;' but this Act had been continually neglected. A bill was introduced to enact that no Parliament should sit for more

¹ Hallam, i. 523.

² Sandford's 'Great Rebellion,' p. 315.

than three years, a new one to be always chosen within three years of the dissolution, which was never to take place in less than fifty days after their assembling, unless by their own consent. Charles at first strongly objected to this bill, but assented to it on February 16, and immediately received a grant of four subsidies, while the people hailed its passing with bonfires and other signs of rejoicing.¹ Ship-money was declared an illegal imposition, and the judgment against Hampden was annulled.

While the House was discussing Irish affairs, after presenting petitions relating to the subject, Pym spoke of the danger of evil counsels to the State, especially when they affected the head of the body politic. A message from the king was presented next day, desiring that such language might be justified by proof of the allegations.

On March 22, the trial of the Earl of Strafford commenced at Westminster Hall, where eighty peers took their places as judges. A private closet was prepared for the king, who was present each day with the queen and prince. Seats were provided for the House of Commons, and for the Commissioners of Scotland and Ireland, who brought their charges. A special place was assigned to the thirteen members who had been appointed the earl's prosecutors, near to whom stood the prisoner with a table and desk before him, and a chair on which he could rest at pleasure. A crowd of spectators filled the hall, and ladies of rank are said to have paid a high price for seats in the gallery. Strafford arrived in a barge from the Tower. When he made his way through the crowd, the people, struck with his noble bearing, respectfully uncovered, and he returned their salute with courtesy. He is said not to have concealed his astonishment at the accusations brought by the Irish deputies, not comprehending how those but lately so submissive to his will should now dare to turn accusers. During the seventeen days of this protracted trial, Strafford defended himself with great ability. To many proofs of injustice and tyranny which were brought against him he could make no satisfactory reply, but he pointed out many exaggerations, and laboured to convince the court that none of the crimes imputed to him justified the charge of high treason. It was, however, proved that he had in Ireland usurped a degree of despotic authority which no previous viceroy had ever ventured to exercise, and which the king himself could not have legally employed.² But it was the sense of his having strongly supported the king in carrying on the government without a Parliament, and of his intention to employ,

¹ Hallam, i. 515.

² Hallam, i. 524.

in crushing English liberty, that most obnoxious of all instruments, the Irish army, which chiefly exasperated his accusers. When the long-desired Parliament was so abruptly dismissed the year before, the guilt of the act was ascribed to Laud and Strafford. Undisputed absolutism had been established in Ireland, and in Pym's long speech in the House of Commons he expressly stated the apprehension that the Irish army would be brought over 'to bring England to a better order. We are not fully conquered.'¹ The 23rd article of impeachment against Strafford declared that he, 'with the help and assistance of the archbishop,' had induced the king to dissolve the late Parliament, had treacherously endeavoured to incense the king against members of the then House of Commons, had 'traitorously and wickedly' counselled his Majesty 'that, having tried the affections of his people, he was loosed and absolved from all rules of government; that he was to do everything that power would admit, and should be acquitted towards God and man; and that he had an army in Ireland (meaning the army of Papists, his dependents) which he might employ to reduce this kingdom.'

This most important article, substantiated by 'a complete chain of proof,' declared the earl's design, should Parliament not grant the subsidies required for the Scottish war, to have recourse to illegal taxation; and in case it were resisted by the people, and the English army were engaged in opposing the Scots, to bring the Irish army into England, by its assistance forcibly to levy taxes. Several of the Council, on being examined, bore testimony to separate parts of this indictment; the Earl of Northumberland deposing to the truth of the words, 'that, having tried the affections of his people, the king was loosed and absolved from all rules of government.' Strafford, aware of the fatal effect of these accusations, summoned members of the Council to depose that he only intended to employ the Irish forces against Scotland. A paper containing short notes of what had passed at the Council on the day when the last Parliament was dissolved strongly confirmed the truth of these allegations against the earl. This paper had been taken by Sir Harry Vane, the younger, from the private cabinet of his father, who was one of the secretaries of state. Vane's notes were read in Westminster Hall on April 13. On the same day Strafford made an eloquent speech in his own defence, and

¹ See Sandford's 'Great Rebellion,' p. 303. This speech was delivered by Pym on November 7, according to the MS. report of D'Ewes, a member of the House, and of others.

Glynne and Pym replied to him 'with much greater force of argument.'¹

Discussions which took place concerning the best course of proceeding ended in substituting a bill of attainder against the earl, in the place of leaving the issue of the trial to be decided by the House of Lords alone. The object of this change was to give to the whole proceeding as much a national character as possible, and it did not prevent the full discussion of the points of law.²

The bill of attainder was passed by the House of Commons on April 21, with only 59 dissidents against 204. The names of most note among the minority were the lawyer Selden, and Lord Digby, son of the Earl of Bristol, who at the same time declared that he believed the earl to be 'the most dangerous minister, and the most insupportable to free subjects.'

On April 29, Mr. St. John explained before the Lords the evidence which had satisfied the Commons, in the presence of the king and queen and the earl himself. Before proceeding to decision, the Lords called upon the judges for their advice whether any of the charges amounted to treason, and, on May 7, the lord chief justice delivered their unanimous opinion that, upon the facts which, as their lordships had agreed, were proved, the Earl of Strafford deserved to undergo the pains and forfeitures of high treason.³ On the same day the Lords passed the bill of attainder without any alteration.

The king had been so ill-advised as to attempt to influence the Lords by going to the House on May 1, while the bill was still pending, and declaring that although he could not in his conscience condemn the earl of high treason, he would not allow him in future to serve him in any place of trust, 'No, not so much as a constable.' Then he besought them to find some way of compromise, concluding: 'Certainly, he that thinks him guilty of high treason, in his conscience, may condemn him of misdemeanour.' This interference with a bill still under discussion had no effect with the Lords, and only served to increase the agitation of the people.⁴

¹ Sandford, p. 340.

² Macaulay sums up the chief objections against proceeding by attainder, when discussing the trial of Sir John Fenwick in the year 1696. A Parliament, it was argued, is more influenced by faction than a jury, and the number of persons concerned lessens individual responsibility.—Macaulay, iv. 747–750.

³ Hume, Clarendon, and some other historians, have omitted all mention of the judges' answer, 'which,' says Hallam, 'seems to have cost Strafford his life' (i. 526).

⁴ Sandford, p. 349. It has been commonly said that Charles summoned both Houses to hear his expostulation. By Sandford's account, derived from D'Ewes's

On May 3, a vast multitude of London citizens and others thronged the streets, calling for justice against Lord Strafford, and threatening those who opposed the bill of attainder. On the same day, Pym made known to the House of Commons that Charles had been plotting to bring up the army from the North to overawe their deliberations; the Tower of London was to be seized, Strafford delivered, and French troops to be landed at Portsmouth to aid in the attempt. Colonel Goring, and Henry Percy, brother of the Earl of Northumberland, had disclosed this plot to certain persons, who revealed it to the popular leaders. Goring, who was governor of Portsmouth, had agreed, it was said, to allow the French troops to land. Deputies were sent to Portsmouth to examine him, and returned satisfied with his promises of honourable conduct for the future.

The sum of £22,000, and the king's warrant for his indemnity, had been offered to Sir William Balfour, lieutenant of the Tower, if he would admit Captain Billingsley, with a body of soldiers, and allow Strafford to escape. Balfour, dreading the vengeance of the House of Commons, rejected the bribe, and disclosed the terms which had been offered him.

Although doubts have been thrown out by some writers concerning this conspiracy, the fact appears to be well attested that Charles had approved the proposal of appealing from the representatives of the people to military force.¹ The queen herself, in letters to Madame de Motteville, described the hopes which she and the king had formed of saving Strafford's life through the interposition of the army. The report of aid from France added to the continual apprehension of Roman Catholic machinations; and Pym availed himself of the excitement of the moment to bind together both Houses of Parliament, and afterwards the kingdom generally, in a bond of association somewhat similar to the famous League and Covenant of Scotland. The Commons, on that memorable May 3, remained with closed doors till the then extraordinary hour of eight; they then drew up and signed what was called a 'Protestation,' in defence of Protestantism, the king's person and power, the privileges of Parliament, and the lawful rights of the people. This was afterwards subscribed by the whole House of Commons, and by the House of Peers, including several Roman Catholics, who signed it on the understanding that it merely pledged them to oppose all attempts to subvert the established religion. It was

Journal and other MSS., it appears that Charles went to the House of Lords, and summoned the House of Commons to attend.

¹ Hallam, i. 531.

afterwards widely circulated for signatures; and a letter is preserved in which Oliver Cromwell recommended it to the attention of the Corporation of Cambridge.¹

An overpowering dread filled the minds of the popular leaders that the king would yet arrest their course by a dissolution, which, notwithstanding the Triennial Bill, might have left the country for three years without a Parliament. In the view of Pym, no time was to be lost for self-defence, and on May 5 he brought forward a bill to provide against the dissolution or suspension of the present Parliament, unless by their own consent. This act was contrary to the constitution, and was the first step of that kind hitherto proposed. The court party, dismayed by the late exposure of the king's designs, appear not to have opposed this bill. The Lords attempted to modify it by stipulating that it should only continue in force for two years; a conference took place, however, and, as the Commons still insisted on its passing without limitation, the Lords at once yielded.

On May 8 this important bill, more dangerous to the monarchy than any yet carried, was brought to the king at the same time with that for the attainder of the Earl of Strafford. Charles had still the power to refuse both bills, but was afraid to do so. He promised an answer at ten o'clock on Monday, the 10th, and signed without opposition that bill which rendered the House of Commons equally independent of their sovereign and of their constituents.² He had already received an affecting letter from the Earl of Strafford, appealing to the king's knowledge of his innocence as to the capital charge, yet declaring his readiness to suffer death if needful. He also released the king from his promise.³

The king passed Sunday (May 9) in great perplexity and distress. We may believe that the shouts of the people as they denounced Strafford and Laud, 'the breakers of the Parliament,' and other more recent cries against the Commoners who resisted the attainder, were still ringing in his ears. He sent for the judges, to inquire the grounds on which

¹ Sandford, p. 355.

² Hallam, i. 532. Sandford, p. 358. 'He lacked the moral courage,' says the latter historian, 'to face the crisis, and signed the bill for the continuance of the Parliament, shifting to the future the chance of evading it.'

³ 'Doubts,' says Hallam, 'have been thrown out by Carte as to the genuineness of Strafford's celebrated letter;' but it is commonly received as authentic, although 'it is certain that he did not expect to be sacrificed by his master' (i. 527, note). The constitutional character of Parliament was less deeply compromised by the proceedings of the bill of attainder than was the royal dignity by acknowledging the king's highest servant to be guilty of *misdeemeanours*.

they had justified the condemnation, and applied to several bishops for their opinion, to quiet his own misgivings. Juxon, Bishop of London, honestly advised the king not to condemn a man whom he believed to be innocent, but four other bishops replied that in his political capacity the king was bound to concur with the two Houses.

Late in the evening, and with tears, Charles signed his name to a commission, and gave his assent to the bill. Yet, even after this, when he could no longer protect the earl as a sovereign, he ventured to appeal to Parliament as a suppliant, and the next day forwarded a letter to the House of Lords by the young Prince of Wales, requesting that, for his sake, the two Houses would consent to substitute a sentence of perpetual imprisonment for that of death. But, evidently fearing to draw down on himself the popular resentment, Charles added, 'If no less than his life can satisfy my people, I must say *fiat justitia*;' adding the strange remark, 'If he must die, it were a charity to reprieve him until Saturday.' No part of this prayer was granted. The king's late conduct had destroyed all confidence in his intentions, and the popular leaders knew that if they spared Strafford's life, Charles would soon pardon and replace him in power.¹

Even after writing to absolve the king from his promise of protection, Strafford appears to have expected favour. When at last he was informed that his doom was irrevocable, he is said to have quoted the words, 'Put not your trust in princes, for in them there is no salvation.'² But he prepared with composure for his impending fate. On May 12, when leaving the Tower to be led to execution, Strafford requested that Archbishop Laud might be allowed to give him his farewell blessing from the window of his cell.

Laud came forward accordingly and raised his hand, but was so overpowered that he fell fainting. The earl had been advised to take a coach to Tower Hill, to screen himself from the mob, but he replied, 'I dare look death in the face, and the people too!' The vast assembled multitude were struck with the dignity of his bearing, and kept respectful silence.

He addressed the people from the scaffold in defence of his conduct, and declared that it augured ill for the cause 'to write the commencement of a reformation in letters of blood.' The legality of the condemnation has been matter of discus-

¹ Lingard, x. 28, note. Sandford, p. 358.

² A similar declaration of willingness to suffer had, three months previously, availed to save the life of Goodman, who had been condemned for taking orders in the Church of Rome.—Lingard, x. 4, note.

sion, even to the present time. The law of Edward III., under which he was tried, defined high treason to be the levying of war against the king, or the compassing the king's death. The law of England had been 'silent as to conspiracies against itself.' 'But the statute of Edward had been,' says Hallam, 'so perpetually stretched' to obtain unjust verdicts on behalf of the court, that neither the people nor the lawyers held it needful to keep closely to its primary bearing.¹ The House of Commons has been generally blamed for interrupting the course of the trial in order to substitute a bill of attainder, the ground of which change was their apprehension of an acquittal by the House of Lords. Royal influence would be exerted to warp any decision made by the majority of that House in its judicial capacity, but they would hardly resist the pressure put on them by a large majority of the Lower House.

A majority of three to one in the Lower House determined that the endeavour of Thomas, Earl of Strafford, to subvert the fundamental laws of England and Ireland was high treason, and the judges confirmed that opinion. The majority against him in the House of Lords was small, only twenty-six peers against nineteen. 'The attainder of Strafford,' says Hallam, 'could not be justified, unless it were necessary;' but the same historian adds, 'Look round the nations of the globe, and say in what age or country would such a man have fallen into the hands of his enemies without paying the forfeit of his offences against the commonwealth with his life.'² The publication of Strafford's correspondence has since gone far to substantiate that he was acting in open defiance of the laws.³ The House of Commons acted with more kindness than any sovereign had yet done in cases of treason, by exempting Strafford's children from the consequences of the attainder.

In May, 1641, the Princess Mary, eldest daughter of the king, was given in marriage to William, son of the Prince of Orange; but, as the princess was only in her tenth year, it was agreed that she should still remain for a time in England. The connexion appears strange, considering the dislike with which Charles regarded both the religious and political institutions of Holland, where the prince was merely a hereditary chief magistrate; but Charles had found his first design of marrying his daughter to the Prince of Spain impracticable, and received promises of assistance, in case of need, from Frederick, Prince

¹ Hallam, i. 525-527.

² *Ib.* 530.

³ It is remarkable that Strafford in his political correspondence frequently used the expression that he would be 'answerable' for his policy *with his head*.

of Orange, who sent him an immediate gift of several thousand pounds. The marriage was generally approved by the English people.¹ The queen had become extremely unpopular, both from her Roman Catholic opinions and the attempts which she was believed to have recently made to influence the army. When it became known that, on the plea of health, she was planning a journey abroad, both Houses joined in a petition that she would remain in England. They apprehended that her real purpose was to procure foreign assistance to be employed against the Parliament. Henrietta yielded for the time, and made a gracious reply in the English language. On July 3 the Commons sent up three bills to the Lords; one for raising a poll-tax for the payment of the armies on disbanding; another for abolishing the Court of Star Chamber; and the third for the removal of 'the younger birth of tyranny, perhaps more hateful,' the Court of High Commission. The king declined at first to consent to the two latter bills; but, after irritating the Commons by this delay, he yielded, and these scourges finally disappeared.² Charles now announced his intention to proceed immediately to Edinburgh to meet the Scottish Parliament, calculating, as it appears, on turning to his own purposes the jealousies and ambition of the leading Scottish noblemen. This resolution excited great distrust in the English House of Commons. A committee of the two Houses was appointed to follow the king and watch his proceedings, of which the Earl of Bedford, Lord Howard, and four commoners were members, with Hampden as their guiding spirit.

After this precaution, the Parliament adjourned from September 9 to October 20, leaving committees of both Houses to sit during the recess.

The Marquis of Hamilton, who had long held a high place in the king's counsels, had of late been in connexion with the Covenanters, whose leader in Edinburgh was the Earl of Argyle. The young Marquis of Montrose, on the contrary, the enemy of both these noblemen, was in correspondence with the king. In June, 1641, the king's emissary, Walter Stuart, was seized by an officer of the Scottish Parliament near the border, and a letter from Charles to Montrose was found concealed in the

¹ Lingard, x. 13.

² Hallam says that the abolition of the Star Chamber was first moved in March, 1641. Several amendments were made by the Lords, and two conferences were held on the subject. From the 'Constitutional History' the reader would suppose that those bills had been assented to before the execution of Strafford, but Mr. Sandford states that they were not passed till July.—'Great Rebellion,' p. 377; Hallam, i. 517, and note.

pommel of his saddle. Other papers being discovered, confirming the suspicion that Montrose was engaged in some treacherous scheme, he and some of his friends were imprisoned in Edinburgh Castle. Although greatly mortified by this turn of affairs, Charles, on his arrival in Edinburgh in September, concealed his feelings, bestowed favours on the principal Covenanters, and listened to Presbyterian sermons with apparent approval. He confirmed all the concessions which he had previously made to the Scottish Parliament, yet maintained a secret correspondence with Montrose, who was endeavouring to effect the destruction of his enemies. According to general report, a plan had been concerted by Montrose, and sanctioned by the king, for the apprehension of Hamilton, his brother, Lord Lanark, and the Earl of Argyle, who were to be sent on board a ship in the Firth, or put to death in case of resistance. Alarmed by rumour of their danger, the three noblemen fled from Edinburgh on the night of October 11, while the citizens closed their gates and took up arms. The king, moreover, was attended to Parliament on the same day by five hundred soldiers and armed men.¹ A Parliamentary inquiry was necessary, and from the notes of the witnesses, which have been preserved, the intended arrest of Argyle and Hamilton cannot be doubted. Charles, however, spared no pains to conciliate his adversaries. The Earl of Argyle was made a marquis, and placed at the head of the treasury; General Lesley was raised to the rank of Earl of Leven; and Hamilton soon afterwards received the title of duke, after having expressed in writing that nothing in that unhappy business, which has been mysteriously termed 'The Incident' in Scottish history, had reflected on his Majesty's honour. The leaders were soon liberated, and, after giving an entertainment to the estates, the king departed for England on November 18. News of the late disclosures had been faithfully forwarded by Hampden to the Parliamentary committee, and still further excited distrust of the king. At the request of Parliament, which resumed its sittings, the Earl of Essex, the commander of the forces, supplied a guard for its protection.² While the king was in Scotland a Conservative reaction had taken place both in Par-

¹ Laing's 'History of Scotland,' iii. 229, and note viii.; and Lingard, x. 38-40.

² The king's Secretary of State, Sir Edward Nicholas, wrote repeatedly from Westminster, urging the king to send a true account of the affair at Edinburgh, which was felt to affect his Majesty's honour, and concerning which his friends were so long kept in darkness. No details appear to have been published, but in November Nicholas writes that the Marquis of Hamilton's letter was satisfactory.—'Evelyn's Diary,' vol. v.

liament and in the country. Hitherto the Liberal leaders of the House of Commons had met with scarcely any opposition, except when they attacked the bishops; and Lord Falkland, Hyde, and others, who afterwards became Royalists, had even supported the fierce decree by which Strafford was brought to execution. Some statesmen active hitherto on the popular side had been recently made peers, and there was increasing satisfaction with the past redress of grievances.¹

But late events, which were still imperfectly known, had quickened Pym to appeal against the influence of evil counsellors. He pointed out the danger that the king was even now devising plans to reverse all his late concessions by the help of the English or Irish army.

On November 1, a committee of the House of Lords informed the Commons that a rebellion had broken out in Ireland avowedly for the purpose of re-establishing the Roman Catholic faith. The body of 8,000 Catholic soldiers which Strafford had disciplined had long been a subject of distrust to the English Parliament, who urged that they should be disbanded; but Charles, who was looking on all sides for assistance, appears to have sent secret orders to the Earls of Ormond and Antrim that instead of the army being reduced it should be greatly enlarged. The Catholics of Ireland complained of many grievances; and, as the Puritans and Covenanters were the bitter enemies of their religion, they appealed to the king and not to the Parliament. Foreign officers, trained in the Spanish service, had been lately in Ireland, and it appears that a revolutionary movement had been for some time in contemplation, and that Charles hoped by means of an armed demonstration in Ireland to overawe the English Parliament; while the Irish Catholics desired to establish a separate Catholic state under the protection of Spain, or at least to gain possession of the lands from which in many places they had been expelled. A plan to surprise the city of Dublin, and take possession of its large store of arms, was fortunately betrayed in time, but the spirit of revolt rapidly pervaded the country. Tumultuary bands plundered the English plantations, robbing and frequently murdering the Protestant settlers, who in many places retaliated, till the island became a scene of unexampled horror and bloodshed. The rebel chiefs published a declaration that they took up arms to support the king and their religion against the tyrannical party in the English Parlia-

¹ Sandford, 412-421.

ment, and exhibited a pretended commission from the king authorising the Irish Catholics to enlist against the Puritans.

Few could believe that the perpetrators of those massacres were supported by the king; but the favour which Charles had recently shown to the Catholics, and his alleged desire to transfer troops for home service from Ireland, inspired strong suspicion that he felt much indifference as to the suppression of the rebellion. When the king received in Scotland the first news of the outbreak, he wrote to his minister, 'I hope this ill news from Ireland may hinder some of these follies in England.' That minister, Secretary Nicholas, had to inform the king, however, in reply, that Parliament 'considered ill counsels to have been the cause of all these troubles in Ireland,' and held itself absolved from giving aid unless 'the ill-counsellors' were exchanged for others whom they could trust.¹ When the news of wide-spreading massacres in Ireland arrived, a thrill of horror ran through the country which called for strong measures against Popery, and Parliament sent the queen's confessor to the Tower. It was agreed that troops should be sent to Ireland, but under whose command? When the Commons proposed the Earl of Leicester, the lord-lieutenant, the Court party opposed it. The king was ready to go himself, but Parliament could not trust him with troops which he might afterwards employ to stifle English liberty. At this time Pym was preparing a very important paper, a survey of the late grievances and of the progress which had been made in their removal, 'by his Majesty's goodness and the wisdom of the Parliament,' adding a strong appeal against evil counsellors and respecting future measures.

Such was the purport of what was termed 'The Grand Remonstrance,' intended to be presented to the king on his return, which produced on November 22 a greater conflict than had ever yet taken place in the House of Commons. To moderate men it appeared unnecessary for themselves, and very ungracious towards the king, to dwell on past grievances and acts of tyranny which had been already swept away or atoned for.

But recent events in Scotland and elsewhere had increased the hostile feeling with which Pym and Hampden regarded the king's counsels, and strengthened their belief that the court

¹ See correspondence in vol. v. 'Evelyn's Memoirs.' Sandford, p. 430; Hallam, i. 543. According to Lingard, Charles had given instructions to Ormond and Antrim to increase the number of troops in Ireland and to surprise the castle at Dublin in order to procure arms.—Lingard, x. 43.

would resume its arbitrary plans if the Commons relaxed their vigilance.¹ Hampden arrived in London at this critical time, and we may readily believe that his experience in Edinburgh added strength to the arguments of his party that it was totally unsafe to rely on the royal word for the maintenance of the newly obtained securities for freedom. It was decided, by the small majority of eleven votes, that the 'Remonstrance' should be printed and be presented to the king. This test of the resolute 'determination of the reformers to maintain their ground was considered by Cromwell so important that it is said that he declared after the division that, if the motion had been rejected, he would have sold his estate and emigrated to America.² So much, however, had a more moderate spirit gained ground during the last few months, that it was apparently still in the king's power to change such a defeat into a victory by showing respect for the laws and keeping faith with his subjects. When, on the 25th of the same month, Charles re-entered London amidst loyal cheers, and attended by the Royalist lord mayor, Gournay, and a troop of citizens on horseback, there was danger lest the work of reconciliation should appear too easy. The king gave an entertainment to the loyal corporation, and conferred knighthood on the lord mayor and several aldermen; but he withdrew the guard from the Parliament, declaring his own presence in the capital to be a sufficient protection to that assembly.³

A favourable change in the administration might now be expected, as Lord Falkland and Sir John Colepepper were raised to high offices, and Hyde also had a place in the king's counsels. The Remonstrance was delivered to the king on December 1. The reply, written by Hyde, asserted that the king had never refused to give his attention to the redress of grievances, that he would maintain all the just rights of his subjects, but would not resign to others the choice of his ministers, and hoped to bring to punishment all who wrongfully opposed his authority.⁴

But the appointment of more enlightened men in the place of the late ministers had little bearing upon the future when the sovereign was guided by his own will; and it has been acknowledged by a very temperate historian that 'no appoint-

¹ Macaulay, i. 104. Secretary Nicholas wrote to the king, on November 8, about this 'declaration which relates all the misgovernment and unpleasing things that have been done by ill counsells (as they call it),' and urgently entreating the king's return.—'Evelyn's Memoirs,' v. 90.

² Hallam, i. 541, and the notes relating to Clarendon, Lingard, x. 48.

³ Sandford, 441.

⁴ Lingard, x. 48.

ment that the king could have made from the patriotic bands of Parliament would have furnished security against the intrigues of his bed-chamber and the influence of the queen.¹ The House of Commons soon afterwards remonstrated so warmly against the king's appointment of Colonel Lunsford to be lieutenant of the Tower, he being a man of intemperate habits and suspected of being engaged in plots against the Parliament, that Charles bestowed the office on another. There was no question on which the spirit of the two Houses of Parliament had been so much at variance as respecting the legislative power of the bishops. The Commons, instigated by the strong feeling in London, had (June, 1641) passed a bill for their exclusion from Parliament, but it was defeated in the Upper House by a large majority. In December a petition was presented to the House of Commons, signed by 15,000 persons, including members of the corporation, protesting against the influence of the bishops, and disclaiming the loyal professions of the lord mayor. Another petition, signed by 30,000 young men of London, prayed 'that episcopacy might be rooted out of the Church of England.' 'The tyranny, folly, and rashness of Charles's bishops,' says Hallam, 'were still greater than his own;' and although there was still a considerable attachment to episcopal government in the kingdom at large, an increasing party in the House of Commons advocated the exclusion of all clergy from civil power.² The temporary downfall of the English episcopacy was accelerated by the imprudence of the Archbishop of York. During December, 1641, the citizens of London had risen in great excitement, declaring that good bills which passed through the Commons had been frustrated by the adverse votes of bishops and popish lords, and they were further incensed by the expected appointment of Colonel Lunsford to the command of the Tower. On December 27, crowds of people impeded the approach to the House of Lords, and the archbishop, irritated by their hostile cries, seized hold of a lad who appeared to be a ringleader. The mob rescued the youth, but the archbishop, although he reached home without injury, thought to avenge the provocation by a protest that, as he and his reverend brethren had been prevented by violence from attending the House of Lords, all laws, votes, and resolutions that might pass during the time of their constrained absence would be null and void. Eleven bishops signed this protest, which received the king's approval.³ But when pre-

¹ Hallam, i. 565.² Hallam, i. 533-537.³ Sandford, p. 455.

sented, it excited indignation even in the House of Lords, and the Commons immediately impeached the twelve prelates of high treason for thus attempting to control the proceedings of Parliament. Ten bishops were sent to the Tower, the remaining two, on account of age and infirmity, were confined under care of the Usher of the Black Rod. A crisis was felt to be approaching which called for the greatest prudence on the king's side. Yet this was the time that Charles chose to act 'singly,' without the advice of his best counsellors.

On January 3, four days after the committal of the bishops, he sent the Attorney-General to the House of Lords to impeach, in his name, of high treason the Lord Kimbolton and Messrs. Hampden, Pym, Hollis, Haslerig, and Stroud, who were all distinguished patriots.¹ The king expected the Lords to immediately order the arrest of these members; but they appointed a committee to search for precedents, and when the king sent a sergeant-at-arms to seize the accused members of the House of Commons, that House made answer that the affair required serious deliberation, but that 'none should be more ready and willing than they themselves to bring the members to a speedy and due trial according to the laws of the land and the privileges of Parliament.'

The charges made by the king against these members were that they had conspired to deprive him of the affection of his people, had excited disobedience in the army, had employed popular clamour to overcome Parliament, and, by inviting a foreign force into the kingdom, namely, the Scottish army, had actually levied war against their sovereign.

The House of Commons met the next day, January 4, as usual, and the accused members took their places. Messages had been sent to the lord mayor and to the Inns of Court, signifying that the House apprehended an attack on their privileges, and requested the protection of a military guard. The king, when informed of this, ordered the lord mayor to refuse the request of the Commons, and to prepare a guard for the royal service only.²

The House were preparing to send their commissioners to the king in reply to the charges, when an officer suddenly

¹ Lord Kimbolton, who was frequently called Lord Mandeville, after his father's second title, was afterwards well known during the civil war as the Earl of Manchester. As Lord Kimbolton he was a member of the House of Lords.

² See papers lately brought to light in the State Paper Office. Forster's 'Arrest of the Five Members,' p. 154. The guard supplied by Lord Essex had been withdrawn from the House by the king's order on the very day of his return to London.—Guizot, i. 211.

interrupted their deliberations by announcing that the king had left Whitehall, attended by three or four hundred soldiers, and was on his way to the House in order to arrest the members whom he had accused. The greatest excitement prevailed, and at the request of the House the five members immediately withdrew. It was the critical moment. Charles, who had already crossed Westminster Hall, had sufficient care of the dignity of Parliament to leave his guard outside, and entered the House uncovered, only accompanied by his nephew Prince Charles, the Elector Palatine.¹

At the king's entrance all the members uncovered and rose from their seats. Casting a hasty glance towards the place where Pym usually sat, the king advanced, requesting the Speaker's permission to make use of his chair for a moment. He ascended the steps accordingly, looked round the chamber, and then said: 'Gentlemen, I am sorry to come among you thus. Yesterday, when I sent a herald to arrest some persons accused of high treason, I expected from you obedience and not an answer. No king of England has been more careful than I wish to be of your privileges; but treason has no privilege.' Having called on Pym and Hollis by name, and receiving no reply, Charles asked the Speaker where the accused members had concealed themselves.

The Speaker, Lenthall, fell on his knees, declaring himself to be merely the organ of the House, without whose direction he had neither ears to hear nor tongue to speak. The king, exclaiming 'The birds have flown;' 'that he expected the House to surrender them,' otherwise he would 'seek them himself, for their treason was foul, but that he would give them a fair trial,' departed, not putting on his hat till he reached the door. As Charles withdrew, some of the members exclaimed 'Privilege!' 'Privilege!' It is said by one to whom the queen disclosed the design, that when Charles left Whitehall that morning he promised that he would become the master of his kingdom, and that she counted the minutes impatiently till his return.²

The failure of this grasp at authority, which, had it succeeded, would have deprived Parliament of all security for its future independence, was signal. It is observed by Lord Clarendon that 'Mr. Hampden was much altered after this accusation; his nature and courage seeming much fiercer than

¹ Elder brother of Prince Rupert, afterwards so well known in the civil war.

² 'Memoires de Madame de Motteville,' quoted by Guizot, i. 233, and Hallam, i. 545.

before ;' and that the greater number of those who had begun to judge more favourably of the king were alienated by this fatal act of violence.¹

The city of London, at this time, contained within its walls between three and four hundred thousand citizens, and was the centre both of the wealth and public spirit which had made England honoured throughout the world. It was known that the five members had taken refuge in the city. Charles issued a proclamation forbidding the citizens to harbour them, and desiring that the ports should be closed. He resolved to make still another attempt in his own person, imagining that the Common Council could not resist an application from their sovereign. It was about ten o'clock on the morning of January 5 when the king again set off from Whitehall, this time without guards, that he might show his entire confidence in his subjects. Some of the crowd which pressed round his carriage entreated him to keep peace with Parliament and to respect its privileges. When the king reached Guildhall, he demanded the persons of the five members, expressed in mild language his attachment to the laws and the Protestant faith, and offered to take dinner at the house of one of the sheriffs, who received him with befitting respect. But the attempt had miscarried, and when Charles returned to Whitehall he felt the humiliation of discomfiture. The House of Commons now adjourned for six days, on the plea of insufficient protection, and appointed a committee to sit at Guildhall. The Common Council presented a petition to the king complaining of the Popish tendencies of his counsellors, and the queen, influenced in turn by rage and terror, besought the king to leave the capital. Charles, indeed, retired with his family to Hampton Court Palace on January 10, never again to return to Whitehall till on the eve of the awful trial of 1649.²

On the day succeeding his departure, the Thames was covered with armed vessels, bringing back the five members in triumph, followed by citizens in their gay barges. Amidst shouts of joy and the discharge of guns the members were restored to their places in the House, and expressed in the warmest terms their gratitude to the citizens of London and to the sheriffs who had defended them. Another procession appeared, consisting of 4,000 knights, gentlemen, and tenant-farmers of Buckinghamshire, to present to the House a petition

¹ Hallam, i. 546.

² Charles now offered a free pardon to the accused members, and the prosecution was abandoned.

against the Popish lords and evil counsellors, and in favour of Hampden, their worthy representative; bringing also another petition to the House of Lords, and a third to the king.

The continuance of the Irish rebellion gave the king a pretext for proposing to head 10,000 volunteers for its suppression; but the Parliament, on the other hand, required that the command of both the army and navy, and the care of the fortresses, should be given to such officers as they should nominate. Since the reign of Queen Mary, authority to summon the inhabitants to arms—in other words, to call out the militia—had been confided in every county to the lord-lieutenant, who, being a resident nobleman or a gentleman of large estate, was considered the official representative of his sovereign. But according to a bill which passed through Parliament in February, 1642, the lords-lieutenant were held responsible to Parliament alone, and could not be removed by the king for the next two years.¹ This encroachment on the royal prerogative could only be justified by the apprehension that Charles was preparing to regain by arms whatever he had conceded under compulsion. He steadfastly refused to surrender the command of the army, but was, during the same month, induced, although most unwillingly, to assent to the exclusion of the bishops from their seats in Parliament—his last concession, in fact, before his final appeal to the sword. The queen, who had been previously detained by the Parliament, now eagerly availed herself of the plea of conducting to Holland her young daughter, the Princess Mary, betrothed to the son of the Stadtholder. She was received with great distinction, and obtained, through the liberality of the Prince of Orange and by the sale of the crown jewels, which she carried with her, valuable assistance towards the expenses of the war for which Charles was preparing.² Several experienced Dutch officers afterwards came to serve in the king's army, although some of the United Provinces remonstrated with the Stadtholder, and testified sympathy with the cause of the English Parliament. Before the queen left England, Charles solemnly promised not

¹ Hallam, i. 554. It is acknowledged by this historian that the two most striking encroachments on the king's prerogative were suggested by his attempts to destroy their privileges; it was after the discovery of Percy's conspiracy for the liberation of Strafford that the bill was passed for perpetuating Parliament, and it was after the king's attempt to seize the five members that the Commons insisted on naming the general of the army.—Hallam, i. 546.

² The young Prince William of Orange, to whom the Princess Mary was united, was at that time only seventeen years of age. He died in 1650. His young widow was soon afterwards the mother of that prince who became in 1688 the king of Great Britain.

to receive any person into his counsels without her consent, and 'that he would never make peace but by her interposition and mediation.'¹ It was scarcely 'within the bounds of natural possibility,' from this time forward, that harmony could be re-established between the king and the people. Charles had tied his own hands, blindly confiding in a woman whose every feeling and prejudice bore witness to the despotic principles of her native land.²

The number of the king's partisans had been lately increased by numerous country gentlemen who flocked to London from remote places—men who despised the citizens and disliked the severe manners of the Puritans; and also by soldiers of fortune lately disbanded from the continental armies, and ready for any royal cause. These new recruits came into frequent hostile collision with the apprentices and other inhabitants of Westminster, who were not sparing of threats against the bishops and the Popish lords. To escape the insults of the populace, Charles withdrew to Newmarket and afterwards to York, still followed by the petitions and remonstrances of the House of Commons, urging him to return to Whitehall.

The great obstacle to every attempt at reconciliation was the command of the army, with which Charles refused to part, and with which Parliament dared not entrust him. The lords-justices in Ireland had urgently besought military aid, and at length, in January, Charles proclaimed the insurgents *rebels*. The Parliament now resolved that troops should proceed to Ireland, but were too ardently occupied with their own affairs to take prompt measures in what did not immediately concern their present struggle. In the North of England the majority of the nobility were Royalists; and when the king fixed his residence at York the neighbouring gentry raised a guard for his protection, which became by degrees a considerable army. At this time of suspense—when both parties were secretly preparing to take arms, yet seeking to shelter themselves under appeals to law and precedent, when the chiefs of the free party were borne on to be leaders in a revolution which far exceeded in violence all their previous intentions—the country was continually excited by the publication of political pamphlets and newspapers, which were read at the markets and at all places of public resort.

Not satisfied with the justification afforded by the crisis

¹ Hallam, i. 575, with reference to 'Life of Clarendon,' p. 79.

² Hallam, i. 575.

itself for overstepping the bounds of law, Parliament declared that the command of the militia did not belong to the king, and that the right to frame the laws of the realm properly existed in Parliament alone.

The people were encouraged to send up petitions in favour of reform, but addresses on the other side sent by the loyal were repulsed, and in some cases their originators were punished. Instances of tyranny and partiality on the part of Parliament supplied Hyde and others with a plea for writing refutations of these illegal pretensions, which were put into the king's hands, copied by him at York, and then published by the order of his Council.¹

But again, when the force of argument might have tended towards reconciliation, Charles committed a fatal error. Anticipating war, he desired to obtain arms and ammunition, of which there was at Hull a considerable store, and he was apprised by some of his friends that Sir John Hotham, the governor, might be persuaded to surrender it. To obtain entrance into Hull, Charles employed a stratagem, sending thither his second son, the Duke of York, and his nephew, as if merely on an excursion of pleasure. The governor showed respect to the young princes, but next morning he received two letters, the one to announce the king's intention of dining with him that day, the other a letter of caution from an unknown person. That caution was heeded, and when, at eleven o'clock, Charles reached Hull, the gates were closed and the walls manned. The governor appeared to answer the king's summons, but refused him admittance, even with twenty horsemen only, replying to the king's demand that he held his office under the authority of Parliament. He restored the two princes, and the king immediately proclaimed him guilty of treason, complaining to Parliament of his repulse. But Parliament readily defended the governor, declaring that the arsenals were not the personal property of the sovereign, but held in trust for the benefit of the kingdom. By their order the magazines were transferred to London for greater security.

Even at York there was far from unanimity; more than fifty gentlemen refused to enrol themselves in the king's guard, and a large number of various ranks assembled at Heyworth Moor on June 3, bringing a petition to the king that he would renounce all thoughts of war and agree to amicable negotiations

¹ Instances of tyranny on the part of Parliament are given by Guizot, i. 259-261, and Hallam, i. 559, and note.

with Parliament. The ardent Cavaliers were averse to all compromise, and told the people that the king would not receive their petition; Charles also appeared embarrassed and eager to escape from the crowd, when the young Sir Thomas Fairfax, whose name first appears in history on that occasion, having made his way with difficulty through the throng, knelt before the king and deposited the petition on the pommel of his saddle, at some personal peril, as it appears, from the king's impetuous movement.¹

After some hesitation respecting his course of action, the Lord Chancellor Littleton sent the Great Seal to the king, and joined the Royalists. This proceeding spread dismay amongst the peers who still remained at Westminster, as the Great Seal alone gives legal sanction to acts of government; but the Commons were not so easily intimidated. They issued prohibitions against any citizen taking up arms at the king's command, and the lord mayor, Gournay, who had attempted to enlist the militia in the king's service, was deprived of his office, and succeeded by Alderman Pennington, an ardent Puritan. The city contributed a loan of £100,000, and a subscription for a military force was opened in Parliament. A knight who refused to subscribe retired to the country to escape the displeasure of the people. The general ardour for the Parliamentary cause was eagerly shown by offerings of plate and jewels brought by the citizens to Guildhall, and which exceeded all expectation, women bringing even their wedding-rings and the ornaments of their hair.²

When Charles heard of this movement he tried to obtain similar gifts, but he could not awaken a like enthusiasm among the middle and lower ranks. He had, however, the Church and the Universities on his side, and a majority of the nobility and landed gentry. The University of Oxford sent its plate to the king; the plate from Cambridge was about to follow, when its delivery was prevented by Cromwell's vigilance. The great body of the middle classes, joined by a considerable number of higher rank, took the parliamentary side, and it has been computed that their party possessed more wealth than that of the king. Algernon Percy, Earl of Northumberland, who was, according to Lord Clarendon, 'the most esteemed person of his rank,' wrote to Chief Justice Banks, in defence of the independent

¹ Guizot, i. 268, who refers to a letter from Sir John Bouchier, one of those present on the moor, to his cousin Sir Thomas Barrington. See also Hartley Coleridge in his 'Northern Biography.'

² Guizot, i. 273-274.

party, that they were arrayed against the king, 'because of the peril of losing that liberty which freeborn subjects ought to enjoy and the laws of the land do allow,' and because the king's advisers were striving to reduce Parliament to be the mere formal instrument in executing the king's commands.¹

Among the king's present advisers at York were men of very different views. Some, like Lords Falkland, Capel, and Mr. Hyde, afterwards Lord Clarendon, had opposed the despotic acts suggested by Laud, but joined the royal cause from attachment to the king's person and to monarchy, or from dread of popular violence. They would have rejoiced in seeing Charles a constitutional king with sufficient power to preserve his personal dignity. But the ardent Cavaliers panted for war, in the full expectation of success, anticipating the complete victory of despotic principles, and these were the king's favourite advisers. Foremost among the Cavaliers was Prince Rupert, the king's nephew, third son of that Princess Elizabeth, married to the Elector-Palatine, who, in the last reign, had been the object of so much Protestant sympathy. Born at Prague in 1619, Rupert was from childhood a soldier of fortune, making warfare both his occupation and pleasure. He was brave but rash in action, violent in temper, and utterly regardless of the dictates of humanity. At the approach of hostilities he and his younger brother, Prince Maurice, offered their services to the king, who immediately placed Rupert in command of a regiment of horse, and gave a commission to Maurice. No English commander on either side allowed his troops such licence to plunder and molest the inhabitants of the country as Prince Rupert. The differences among his advisers added to the king's instability of purpose, and led to inconsistency in his conduct. Even on June 15, after efforts had been made in all directions to enrol troops, the peers at York published a declaration denying that the king intended to make war on the Parliament, and asserting that all his endeavours were directed to the settlement of the Protestant religion, the maintenance of the just privileges of Parliament, and the liberty of the people—'an ill-judged and even absurd piece of hypocrisy,'

¹ See Forster's 'Essay on the Civil Wars,' p. 275. The Earl of Northumberland took no part in the judgment of the king. At the accession of Charles II., he set an example, too rare among the survivors of revolutions, by defending in Parliament those instrumental in the downfall of Charles I.—Sandford, p. 291, note.

says Hallam, but bearing Lord Falkland's signature, with those of forty-five members of the Council.¹

So contrary was the king's own language to this protest, that immediately after its publication two lords who had joined him returned to the Parliament, one of whom declared to Colonel Hutchinson his disgust at Charles's duplicity.² The whole country was now thrown into confusion ; in every county, and in nearly every town, recruits were enlisted for the service of either the king or the Parliament; some perplexity being caused by the use on both sides of similar phrases. Men were exhorted to take up arms 'for the defence of the Protestant religion, the king's person, dignity, and authority, the laws of the land, the peace of the kingdom, and the privilege of Parliament.' By borrowing these latter words, the king was said to have mocked the Parliament, but the Parliament also surely mocked the king by raising forces against him while nominally undertaking his defence. There was still, however, a strong desire among many reformers to throw the blame of past acts of tyranny rather on the king's partisans than on himself. It was against the spirit of the Constitution for either king or Parliament to act alone, and therefore either form of summons was illegal. On June 17, commissioners arrived at York, bringing to the king nineteen propositions founded upon former addresses. Civil war might still be averted, it was said, if he would consent to them. Parliament demanded that with them should rest the sanction of all officers, both civil and military, that they should advise concerning the education and marriages of the royal children, and be empowered to effect alterations in the liturgy and government of the Church. They required that peers of the Roman Catholic faith should no longer have votes in the House of Lords, and that no peers should continue in Parliament who were disapproved by the Commons.

It is not surprising that Charles was indignant at hearing proposals which would, as he declared, have rendered him but 'the phantom of a king,' reigning by the will of the Parliament, and wearing an empty crown. The terms offered to the king after he had been repeatedly defeated were scarcely more severe; in fact, these were as restrictive as any could be, compatible with the maintenance of the royal office.³ Parliament had expected the king's re-

¹ Hallam, i. 566, note ; Guizot, i. 270, and Mrs. Hutchinson.

² 'Memoir of Colonel Hutchinson,' fourth edition, p. 93.

³ Hallam, i. 556 ; Guizot, i. 275.

jection of these terms. But still, on July 9, Sir Benjamin Rudyard, a leading patriot, ventured to remonstrate with the House of Commons on the appalling crisis, reminding them of the extent of their late triumphs; that monopolies and ship-money had been abolished, and episcopal power restrained. 'If once civil blood be shed,' exclaimed Rudyard, 'we fall into certain evil, while striving for uncertain, unattainable success. Blood cries for vengeance, and defiles the country in which it is shed.' Forty-five members joined in this unsuccessful protest.¹

Parliament ordered another Great Seal to be made, which was entrusted to commissioners. They had already voted a levy of 16,000 men; the trained bands of London, commanded by General Skippon, professed the greatest zeal in the cause, and the Earl of Essex was appointed lord general, with a solemn promise from both Houses of their resolute support during the approaching war. Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex, the son of the unfortunate favourite of Queen Elizabeth, had been in 1639 lieutenant-general of the army which Charles sent to Scotland, although, even at that time, it was known that he had friends among the English Presbyterian party.

When Charles suddenly withdrew from London in 1641, he desired Essex to follow him, but the earl, who had been treated with discourtesy by the king, refused to do so, on the plea of duty in the House of Lords. Charles immediately deprived Essex of all his offices, and, on his accepting the command of the parliamentary armies, proclaimed him a traitor.

In the North of England, where Royalists predominated, Ferdinando, Lord Fairfax, a zealous Presbyterian, was appointed the general-in-chief of the parliamentary forces, and the same Sir Thomas who presented the petition on Heyworth Moor, a young officer who had served on the Protestant side in Holland, was named general of horse under his father. It appears by a list of the nobility made in May, 1642, that at that time forty-two peers continued to sit at Westminster; thirty-two were at York with the king, who were joined by more than ten others after the commencement of the war.² There were commonly during the civil war not more than thirty peers in the House of Lords, and those felt themselves controlled by the more urgent will of the Commons.

At the beginning of July, five peers and ten members of the

¹ Guizot, i. 277, and references to 'Parliamentary History.'

² Hallam, i. 567, note.

House of Commons were appointed a 'Committee of Public Safety,' to watch over the defence of the kingdom; and an army was summoned, in which Lord Kimbolton, afterwards Earl of Manchester, and Lord Brook held commands, with Hampden, Hollis, and Oliver Cromwell, under Lord Essex. Hampden subscribed a thousand pounds to the funds required, and raised a regiment of infantry among his neighbours in Buckinghamshire. His men, known by their green uniform, were considered some of the best soldiers in the army.¹ Each side desired to throw the blame of approaching war on its adversary. Meanwhile the queen had exerted herself so far as to despatch from Holland arms, cannon, and ammunition. But even after Charles received these, and had replied to the last parliamentary proposals, he was persuaded by his Council to make a last effort for peace, offering to disarm his adherents, to settle all differences in a parliamentary way, if Parliament would repeal the ordinance of the militia, give up the command of the navy to the admiral whom he appointed, and meet him in some place exempt from interference, for further negotiation.²

Colonel Goring, governor of Portsmouth, was commissioned by Parliament to train new recruits. He hesitated whether or not to accept this commission, and, when pressed to join the Parliamentary army, administered to the soldiers and inhabitants of Portsmouth an oath couched in terms of allegiance to the king, whereupon Parliament ordered Lord Essex to lay siege to the town. The king immediately proclaimed Essex and his officers guilty of treason, and Parliament retaliated by calling the royal proclamation a libel.³ Charles had frequent reason to dread the effects of indiscreet zeal, when the Cavaliers forced their way into houses belonging to the adherents of the Parliament, whom they plundered of horses, arms, and money. To guard against such disorder, and to arouse all possible zeal on his behalf, the king passed through some of the counties nearest to York, calling the principal inhabitants together and thanking them for aid with more affability than he had been accustomed to testify.⁴ He was now, indeed, resolved on an appeal to arms. Issuing a summons to meet him in arms addressed to all his loyal subjects north of the Trent, and within twenty miles to the south of it, Charles proceeded with his escort to Nottingham; and on the hill which overlooks the

¹ Carlyle's 'Cromwell,' i. 98. Forster and Lord Macaulay state £2,000 as the amount of Hampden's subscription.

² Hallam, i., conclusion of note at p. 566, and Lingard, x. 67.

³ Lingard, x. 68.

⁴ Guizot, i. 282.

town placed his proclamation in the hands of the herald. It was the evening of August 22, and the reading had begun, when some scruple troubled the king; he again took the paper, and, after correcting some passages on his knee, returned it to the herald, who had some difficulty in reading the corrections. Whilst the trumpets sounded, the royal standard was brought out which bore the words, 'Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's.' It was difficult to fix the standard in the rocky ground, and it fell in the course of the night, an evil omen in the eyes of many.¹ Towards the middle of September the king left Nottingham, and, being advised that the western counties were favourable to his cause, he took up his station at Shrewsbury.

The Earl of Essex, on the other hand, left London with the army on September 9, amidst the joyful plaudits of a vast multitude, and joined 20,000 men at Northampton. He was accompanied by a committee of Parliament, which declared that their intention in taking up arms was to rescue the king and his sons from their evil counsellors. But after a short interval the news reached London that Charles, strengthened by fresh levies, by troops destined for Ireland, and by the help of the English Catholics, was preparing to march upon the city. Strong measures of defence were immediately taken; even women and children aided in erecting barricades to guard against the return of that king whose flight had so recently been the subject of complaint.

The first engagement took place near Keynton, in Warwickshire, and was called the battle of Edgehill; 12,000 Royalists, commanded by Lord Lindsay and Prince Rupert, being opposed to 10,000 men under Lord Essex. The impetuous charge of Prince Rupert had put to flight the left wing of the Parliamentary army, when Hampden, who brought up the artillery, turned the fortune of the day, and Prince Rupert, on his return from the pursuit, found the royal infantry in disorder, Lord Lindsay mortally wounded, and the royal standard in the hands of the enemy, from which, however, it was afterwards rescued. Neither party would yield to the other the honour of the victory. The king had lost more officers than his adversaries, but the army of the Parliament a greater number of soldiers. Hampden, and many others zealous in the cause, urged Essex to renew the combat the next day, but the officers trained in continental warfare counselled a suspension of hostilities, and after a few

¹ Guizot, p. 283, and a letter from Lord Sunderland to his wife, quoted by Lady Theresa Lewis.—'Lives from the Clarendon Gallery,' p. 124.

days the king established himself at Oxford, his most faithful city, but only to halt for three days.¹ London had been saved from an immediate attack, but again trembled for its safety when Banbury, Henley, and Reading successively admitted the royal forces. The alarm which prevailed in the city encouraged the House of Lords to propose negotiations; Essex was desired to advance to protect London, and the king was requested to allow six deputies to approach him with terms of accommodation. The House of Commons opposed these views, and the lord mayor convoked a general meeting; it was addressed by Lord Brook and Sir Harry Vane, who urged the citizens to take up arms.

But, whilst negotiations were supposed to be in progress, the sound of cannon was heard in London. Lord Essex, who was in the House of Lords, immediately mounted his horse and hurried to the scene of action with all the forces at his command. Regardless of the pending treaty, the king had advanced to Brentford, and, under cover of a fog, surprised part of the regiment quartered there. Many of Hollis's soldiers were slain or driven into the river, but their brave resistance, soon aided by the regiments of Hampden and Lord Brook, supported for some hours the attack of the royal army and checked their advance.

In London, indignation at the king's imputed treachery took the place of fear at his approach. New levies, both of militia and volunteers pressed forward towards Brentford; and on November 14, two days after the engagement, Essex, accompanied by a great number of members of both Houses, reviewed 24,000 men at Turnham Green, less than a mile from the king's advanced posts; on which Charles, finding himself too weak for further operations, withdrew to Reading, and took up his winter quarters at Oxford.² Thus ended the first campaign, with little success to the Parliamentary cause.

The battle of Edgehill had convinced Cromwell that their triumph could only be secured by enrolling men of religious zeal to meet the gentlemen and higher-born followers of the king. Hampden having agreed, Cromwell exerted himself to form a powerful association by enlisting the sons of respectable tenants from the seven eastern counties, where he was well

¹ Guizot, i. 292; Miss Aikin's 'Charles I.,' ii. 308.

² Guizot follows May's 'History of the Long Parliament,' and considers that Lingard has not described the affair at Brentford correctly. Mrs. Hutchinson also imputes treachery to the king. Milton, in his eighth sonnet, bears witness to the alarm which he shared at the projected assault of London, when he resided in a house in Aldersgate Street, just outside one of the city gates.

known. Addressing these levies, Cromwell disclaimed the hypocritical words of the notices first issued. 'I do not tell you,' said he, 'that you engage to fight for the king and the Parliament. Should I find myself opposed personally to the king, I should fire as freely as against any other adversary. If your conscience will not allow you to do so, be no follower of mine.' All luxury was forbidden by Cromwell. His soldiers tended their own horses, cleaned their arms, and were punctual alike in their religious rites and in their observance of military rule. At the opening of the next campaign, about a thousand such men obeyed Cromwell's command.¹

The queen had repeatedly sent supplies of arms and ammunition from Holland. About the middle of February she herself arrived at Burlington, in Yorkshire. Admiral Batten, who had been ordered to intercept her passage, cannonaded the row of houses where she was lodged, thereby forcing her to depart into the country with a few attendant ladies, but general displeasure was felt at this attack. The Earl of Newcastle hastened to conduct the queen to York, where, during some months, she held a private court. She was accompanied to England by several soldiers of fortune, and became the centre of the Roman Catholic Royalists.

Parliament vindictively determined on May 23, by a unanimous vote, to impeach her of high treason, but the charge was too preposterous to be sustained.² The king retorted by denying the name of Parliament to the assembly at Westminster. The opponents of negotiations for peace were strengthened by the discovery of a conspiracy formed by Edmund Waller, a relative of the Parliamentary general, for admitting part of the royal army into London, concerning which Pym on May 31 made a statement to the House. The plotters appear to have expected the co-operation of all those most ardent for peace, and to have had a commission from the king for raising men and money, secretly brought from Oxford. The Parliament appointed a solemn day of thanksgiving for their deliverance, and ordered the persons accused to be brought to trial by a council of war. Two principal citizens suffered execution for taking part in the design. Waller, after

¹ These troops were called the 'Ironsides,' a term which is said to have been first given to Cromwell himself. Excepting some regiments of tenants and yeomen, like Hampden's and the London forces, the army of Essex was inferior in station to the Royalists.—Sandford, p. 538.

² Hallam, i. 576; Sandford, p. 565. Henrietta was so obnoxious that this proceeding met with but moderate opposition. The promise which she was believed to have extorted from the king against making peace was the justification.

being brought to the bar of the House, was expelled, and sentenced to death; but was reprieved by Essex, and after paying a fine of £10,000, and suffering a year's imprisonment, was allowed to leave the kingdom.

Both Houses, after the detection of this conspiracy, took an oath not to lay down arms so long as Papists were allowed to serve against them, and never to join with forces raised by the king's sole authority. This oath was unanimously taken even by some who were at the time in secret communication with the king, such hypocrisy being the usual result of religious or political tests.¹ After Reading had been taken, Hampden urged Lord Essex to make a rapid march upon Oxford to surprise and capture the king; but this Essex refused, and many were dissatisfied with his slow mode of warfare. On June 17, Prince Rupert left Oxford on one of his predatory expeditions, and burned the village of Chinnor. Hampden, intending to intercept his return, engaged in a skirmish on Chalgrove Field, where he received his mortal wound. Having been carried to Thame, near the boundary of his beloved Buckinghamshire, Hampden's last act was to write a few lines of counsel respecting the war. He was borne to the grave by his soldiers. His death excited general sorrow and dismay among the number who relied upon his patriotism and strict integrity, and was viewed by the Royalists as equal to a victory.²

Other misfortunes befel the Parliament. Sir William Waller was unfortunate as a general, and his army of 8,000 men was nearly destroyed near Devizes. The queen arrived at Oxford, bringing Charles powerful reinforcements; and Bristol, the second city of the kingdom, was taken by Rupert. Meantime, the Royalists at Oxford were distracted by jealousies. The Earl of Montrose, following out the design frustrated at Edinburgh, persuaded the king to look with suspicion on the Duke of Hamilton and his brother, Lord Lanark, who were put under arrest on their arrival at Oxford. Lord Lanark escaped to London, but Charles sent Hamilton a prisoner to Pendennis Castle, in Cornwall, whence he was afterwards removed to St. Michael's Mount, and remained in prison until released by the Parliamentary army. There was another nobleman at Oxford of unstable character, with whom

¹ Hallam, i. 577.

² Lord Brook, who had been appointed general for four central counties, and was highly esteemed by Parliament, was killed when besieging the Royalists at Lichfield, on March 1, 1643.—Miss Aikin's 'Charles I.' ii. 337.

the king formed a political intrigue, the Earl of Antrim, an Irishman, connected by marriage with the late Duke of Buckingham. Antrim had joined the Irish rebels, but left them to repair to the court at Oxford. It was agreed, with the approval of the king and Montrose, that Antrim should raise forces in Ulster, and make a descent in the ensuing spring on the coast of Argyle to favour the royal cause. Another emissary would, if possible, procure troops and arms from Denmark to assist in the Scottish war.¹ The late ill fortune of the Parliamentary forces gave renewed strength to that large party which took every opportunity of proposing conciliatory measures; and the advice of the Earl of Essex might have resulted in negotiations, if the king's irritating denial of the claims of the assembly at Westminster to be called a Parliament had not shut up all avenues to peace.² The House of Commons, determined to persevere resolutely in the contest, reinforced their army, and thanked the commanders. Lord Essex, declaring his readiness to abide by their decision, raised the siege of Gloucester, and on September 20 obtained a partial success over the Royalists at Newbury. This action cost the life of Lord Falkland, the best and most patriotic of the king's adherents, known to be already weary of the war, a man who, notwithstanding the violence of party spirit, was universally respected by the people.

After the failure of the attempted negotiation, the Earls of Bedford, Holland, and Clare 'stole away to Oxford,' and the Earl of Northumberland retired to his country seat; but at the king's court they were so ungraciously received, and were so ill-satisfied with the ascendancy of the 'Popish party,' that they shortly afterwards returned to Westminster. Some who had served on the king's side at Newbury also rejoined the Parliament with expressions of repentance. Hallam observes upon this, that the ignominious treatment of these moderate men exhibited such fatal want of judgment, that no military success could have conferred liberty or repose upon the country under Charles's rule.³

On December 8, 1643, John Pym, Hampden's great coadjutor, died in Westminster, overcome by the toil which he had undergone for the great cause of the nation. All possible honour was paid to his memory; the House appointed a committee to examine his affairs, to erect a monument in

¹ Cust's 'Memoir of the Marquis of Montrose,' p. 451; Lingard, x. 147, note.

² Hallam, i. 577; Guizot, i. 337.

³ Ib. 578; Sandford, pp. 577-578.

Westminster Abbey, and to defray his debts from the public funds.

Although there had long been sympathy and goodwill between the principal Scottish Covenanters and the English leaders, no aid had yet been furnished to the Parliamentary army from that quarter. One of Pym's last acts in Parliament was to obtain a vote that an application should be made to the Scottish Assembly for assistance; and on July 20, 1643, commissioners, with full powers to negotiate a treaty, were sent to Edinburgh. The principal of these was Sir Harry Vane. They went to Scotland by sea, preferring a voyage of twenty days to the risk of a journey through the troubled northern country. The Scots offered hearty co-operation, encumbered, however, by the imperative condition that their religious system, according to the Covenant, should be adopted by England. Vane, who was averse to the attempt of establishing religious uniformity by compulsion, endeavoured in vain to conclude merely a civil instead of a religious treaty. The Scots insisted on the Covenant, but Vane added words promising reform of religion, 'according to the Word of God and the example of the best reformed churches,' by which he hoped to secure a retreat for independent opinion.¹ In England the League and Covenant, with some amendments, was approved by both Houses, and ordered to be subscribed by all persons in office, and generally by the whole nation. The House of Commons at this time consisted of about 228 members, and only about thirty peers remained in the Upper House.²

An assembly of divines was convened at Westminster, in December, which held its sittings in the Jerusalem Chamber, joined by the Scottish Commissioners and members of the House of Commons, deputed to aid the proceedings. 'The like of that assemblie,' says Baillie, one of the Scottish deputies, 'I never did see'. . . . 'the like was never in England, nor anywhere is shortly like to be.' The object of arranging a fixed form of faith and worship for England was partly effected by the Directory of Worship, substituted for the old Prayer-book, and by the Confession of Faith and the catechisms, confirmed by the authority of Parliament, but not enforced until August, 1645.

But the articles rendering the Presbyterian discipline com-

¹ Forster's 'Life of Vane,' p. 63; Lingard, x. 96. Lord Clarendon represents that Vane 'abhorred the Covenant,' and altered many expressions in it. (See Forster.) By inserting the word 'League,' the English deputies thought to give the agreement a wider scope.

² Hallam, i. 583, and Sandford's appendix to his 'Great Rebellion.'

pulsory were never enforced throughout England. There was no enthusiasm excited here, as there had been in the Scottish nation, when Charles interfered with their ritual. Even in the clerical assembly at Westminster, Independents were intermixed with Presbyterians, and although some time afterwards (June, 1646) Presbyterianism became the national religion, 'the spirit of the times favoured toleration, and Independent and Baptist churches were set up in many places.'¹ The oppression which had befallen the Puritan clergy under the king's government was now succeeded by the ejection of about 1,600 clergymen who refused to agree to the Covenant, and who constituted probably more than one-fifth of the beneficed clergy.² It was arranged by the treaty at Edinburgh, that the Scottish Parliament should furnish an army of 21,000 men, whose services should be remunerated in England at the rate of £31,000 per month. From this time the prospects of the Parliamentary cause were no longer desperate. At the commencement of the war, the Parliament directed that the theatres should be closed, such diversions being unsuitable to so grave a time. The sports hitherto usual on Sundays and holidays were now forbidden, even the May-pole; and such severity of manners prevailed as was distasteful to the more moderate Puritans. Even Mrs. Hutchinson blames that affected peculiarity of 'habit, looks, and words,' by which, 'when Puritanism grew into a fashion,' the greater number of zealots distinguished themselves. In opposition to the flowing locks of the Cavaliers, the Puritans scarcely allowed their hair to cover their ears, whence they gained the nickname of 'Round-heads' at the beginning of the war. That name was ill-applied to such as Colonel Hutchinson, who, as he retained his handsome head of hair, was scarcely allowed by the precise zealots to be religious, 'because,' as his wife tells us, 'his hair was not of their cut, nor his words in their phrase.'³

When, in pursuance of the treaty, the Scottish army in January entered England, the news brought by their commanders much increased the hostility towards the king. The Earl of Antrim had been arrested by the Scots when attempting to land upon their coast; and by letters found upon his person it was shown that at the time when Charles solicited Parliament to supply means for the suppression of the Irish rebels,

¹ Tayler's 'Retrospect of Religious Life in England,' pp. 129-137.

² Hallam, i. 585. The number thus persecuted is shown to have been much exaggerated. The Covenant was not made a test universally. See note, ib.

³ Life of Colonel Hutchinson, p. 100.

he was negotiating with Antrim and Montrose for those Irish Catholics to join the Royalist forces in England.¹

The Irish rebellion was no longer the lawless outbreak of a turbulent people; twenty-four rebel leaders at Kilkenny had professed loyalty to the king, and Charles desired the Earl of Ormond, the commander of the Protestant troops, to negotiate for their aid. Five Irish regiments accordingly invaded Flintshire in November, 1643, where the reports of their ferocity so terrified the people that they were unopposed for some weeks. The garrison of Nantwich first offered resistance, and Sir Thomas Fairfax, with troops from Yorkshire, obtained on January 15, 1644, what was called 'a miraculous victory' over them. Among the prisoners taken by Fairfax was that Colonel Monk, celebrated in after years, who, after a short imprisonment, became a Parliamentary officer. Charles, disappointed at this failure, and aware that he was losing the attachment of many Royalists, was advised to rally his best friends to his side by summoning them to form a Parliament at Oxford. Forty-three peers and 118 commoners obeyed the summons on January 22.

The king, in a gracious speech, now deplored the continuance of the war, and the greater number of those who formed this convention were so eagerly desirous of peace, that probably they would have made large concessions to obtain it. The chief English noblemen were greatly disgusted by the rude and arrogant bearing of the Princes Rupert and Maurice, who cared nothing for the laws of England; and were irritated by the intermixture of Catholics, who relied on the queen's protection. To Charles, any Parliamentary restraint, however Royalist in character, was irksome; it was still more repugnant to the queen.² A letter signed by all the members of the convention was sent to the Earl of Essex, praying him to intercede with those by whom he was trusted for such measures as might lead to peace; but Essex refused to transmit the letter so long as the assembly sitting at Westminster was not acknowledged as a Parliament by the king. Charles at length allowed another letter, duly addressed, to be substituted, but the irritation on both sides precluded all hopes of pacification, and fresh preparations were made for war. The continued exactions and plunder greatly enraged the country people, and the king's chances of success were fast waning. But the Royalist cause was still bravely maintained by the loyalty of individuals of

¹ Laing's 'History of Scotland,' iii. 256; Guizot, ii. 21.

² Hallam, i. 589.

high rank, among whom the Earl and Countess of Derby deserve a foremost place.

The earl was sovereign in the Isle of Man, and a territorial prince in Lancashire. In the winter of 1644, anxious rumours recalled him to the island, and he left his wife and children at Latham Castle, near Ormskirk, which he had fortified against attack, and which was protected by a small garrison, aided by the country people. On February 28, Sir Thomas Fairfax appeared before the castle, requesting to see Lady Derby, whom he offered to remove, with her children, servants, and goods, except arms and ammunition, to the family seat at Knowsley.

But the Countess Charlotte de la Tremouille, who was related to the reigning family of France, declared with manly courage that she held the castle under a double trust—of faith to her husband and allegiance to the king, and refused to submit to terms. Fairfax left troops to carry on the siege, but they were so much impeded by the attacks made by the garrison, that some weeks passed before the lines were completed. Lady Derby was continually present on the walls, standing amidst the smoke and bullets, regardless of danger. The siege had lasted three months, and both food and ammunition were fast failing, when the besieged were rejoiced by the sight of the earl's banner. Lord Derby had hastened back to Lancashire, and after assisting Prince Rupert to regain Bolton-le-Moors, arrived in time to raise the siege of Latham, after which the earl and countess retired to the Isle of Man.

But the counsels of Cromwell were now paramount. On the same day that the convention met at Oxford, Lord Kimbolton, now Earl of Manchester, was appointed general of the army of the eastern counties, with Oliver Cromwell as his lieutenant-general. These forces, joined to those of Lord Fairfax and the Scots, besieged the Earl of Newcastle at York for three months. Charles heard with dismay of the imminent peril of York, and urged Prince Rupert to hasten to its relief. At his approach with 'a prodigious army,' the Parliamentary generals, joined by the Scots under the Earl of Leven, drew off their forces to Marston Moor, where, on July 2, the bloodiest battle of the war was fought between nearly equal numbers. According to the report of Mr. Ash, chaplain of the Earl of Manchester, each army numbered above 20,000 men.

The Cavaliers, commanded by Rupert and Newcastle, included men of rank, courtiers, and 'the cream of all the Papists in England.' On the other side, says Ash, the resolution of the

soldiers was sustained by good fellowship on the part of their officers, and by their abhorrence of Popery and tyranny. At the onset, at seven o'clock of the evening, the impetuous charge of Prince Rupert put the Scots to flight, and caused Fairfax to retreat.

A courier instantly hurried off to Oxford, carrying news of a Royalist victory, and the city bells were prematurely rung. But Cromwell, at the head of 5,000 invincible combatants, turned the fortune of the day, rallying the forces of Fairfax, and at ten o'clock not a Royalist remained alive on the plain who was not a prisoner. Cromwell was the hero of the day, and, according to some accounts, the epithet 'Ironsides' was first applied to him and his men after this battle.¹

All the artillery and baggage, and Prince Rupert's standard, were taken by the victors. The latter was publicly displayed at Westminster, where more than a hundred flags might also have been carried, had not the victorious soldiers torn them to pieces, to ornament their caps or bind round their arms. This defeat extinguished the king's power in the North, where, at the beginning of the war, it had predominated. York capitulated on July 16, and the Marquis of Newcastle, displeased with the treatment which he had received from Prince Rupert, set sail for Hamburg, abandoning the royal cause, and did not return to England till 1660. The Scots closed their campaign by taking possession of Newcastle, where they passed the winter.

At the same time that Fairfax and Cromwell were besieging York, Lord Essex and Sir William Waller were preparing to lay siege to Oxford. At the end of May the king found his loyal city nearly surrounded, but he succeeded in extricating himself, leaving on June 3, with his eldest son, whilst the Duke of York and the court still remained in the city. Great was the disappointment of the Parliament at the king's escape, and Waller was directed to intercept his course. An action followed on June 29, at Cropredy Bridge, the northernmost point of Oxfordshire, where Waller was defeated. Cheered by this success, Charles resolved to pursue Essex, who had marched into Devonshire to meet Prince Maurice, having dispersed the Royalists and raised the siege of Lyme.²

After a hasty flight from Oxford, the queen had been

¹ Guizot, ii. 53. 'The two bloodiest battles,' says Mr. Merivale, 'ever fought by Englishmen in England were both in the vicinity of York,' that of Towton in 1461, when Edward IV. was victorious, and that of Marston Moor.

² Ib. ii. 48-55.

delivered of a daughter at Exeter, after which she besought permission to go to Bath, but Essex declined her request. On July 14 she fled to Falmouth, and reached France in safety.

Essex, pursued by the king as he advanced into Cornwall, hitherto the most Royalist county, began to recognise the insecurity of his position. Accordingly he solicited help, urging that Waller should make a diversion by attacking the royal forces in the rear. He appealed in vain. Charles, however, upon receiving the news of his defeat at Marston Moor, addressed Essex, as commander-in-chief, in an earnest letter conveying assurances of his high esteem, and entreating his aid in the restoration of peace. Anticipating that his word might be distrusted, he permitted eighty-four officers of the royal army to sign a letter pledging themselves to draw the sword against him should he swerve from the line laid down. Prince Maurice and the Earl of Brentford concurred in this declaration.¹ Firm in fidelity to those from whom he had received his commission, Essex replied that all negotiations must be carried on with Parliament, of which he was only the officer, and he accordingly transmitted these letters to Westminster. But although treated with so much respect by his adversaries, the situation of Essex was becoming daily more perilous. His soldiers were deserting, provisions were failing, and his army was enclosed by the sea and the combined forces of the king and Prince Maurice.

In this emergency, Essex, accompanied by two other officers, escaped from the small port of Fowey and reached Plymouth, leaving Major-General Skippon to capitulate with the rest of the army. After they had surrendered their arms and ammunition, the troops were allowed to march to Poole and Wareham, whence transports carried them to Portsmouth; here they received supplies from Parliament, of which they had long been in great need. Essex wrote to the Parliament from Plymouth, concerning the great calamity which had befallen him, urging that an inquiry should be instituted, as he had not been provided with requisite aid. The two Houses, however, declined the inquiry, and wrote to assure Essex of their continued confidence in his fidelity, and their hopes soon to assemble an army strong enough to re-establish the prospects of their cause.

Meantime, the king was elated by the news of successes in Scotland, achieved by Montrose, who commanded the High-

¹ Lingard mentions only the eighty-four officers. It was at Lostwithiel in Cornwall that, on August 6, Essex received these letters. See also Guizot, ii. 58; Aikin, ii. 417.

landers and the lawless Irish sent over by Antrim. Charles still hoped to repair the defeat at Marston Moor, and to enter London in triumph; but the troops of Waller and Essex united, protected London on the west, and on the first news of the king's approach, five regiments of militia prepared for service. A fierce battle took place at Newbury on October 27, in which the Parliament gained a partial success, and Charles soon afterwards again retired to winter at Oxford.¹

Archbishop Laud had remained imprisoned in the Tower since January, 1641, and moderate men hoped that the aged primate, being without any power of injury, might have been spared further punishment. But the presence in London of the Scottish commissioners who were assisting in new regulations for public worship quickened Presbyterian bigotry, and an accidental occurrence rekindled the popular animosity. On the death of a Kentish rector, the lords required the archbishop to give his official sanction to the clergyman of their choice, but the king, who had fixed upon another person for the office, forbade the primate to obey. Laud attempted to defer his decision, on which the Upper House resolved to proceed to his trial, and the Commons committed to Prynne, the victim of Laud's cruelty in the time of his power, the task of collecting articles of accusation. The process was tedious; Laud, after having confronted his accusers at the bar of the House of Lords with spirit, was summoned to the bar of the Commons, who, on November 13, passed against him a bill of attainder, and sentenced him to suffer the penalties of treason. After considerable hesitation among the reduced number of peers, a small majority assented to the vote, and on January 10 the archbishop was led to the scaffold and submitted with fortitude. 'His execution,' says Dr. Milman, 'was the most barbarous crime of those dark days; an act of wanton, unnecessary revenge.'² About the same time the liturgy of the Church of England was definitely set aside, and succeeded by the Directory of the Assembly, nearly resembling that of Scotland; but, notwithstanding the strong influence of the Presbyterians, their discipline was never completely obeyed, except in London and in Lancashire.³

¹ The soldiers of Essex are said to have shown extraordinary valour in this combat, and were delighted to regain possession of the cannon which they had been obliged to sacrifice in Cornwall. Lord Essex, dejected and out of health, was absent from the field, where Lord Manchester commanded.

² Milman's 'St. Paul's,' p. 346. No further cruelty followed decapitation, which was boasted as an act of mercy.

³ Hallam, i. 610.

Sir John Hotham and his son were executed by order of Parliament, because they had been induced to negotiate with the king for the surrender of Hull. Yet the powerful party which advocated peace so far gained ascendancy, that on January 30 commissioners from the king and Parliament met at Uxbridge, seeking if possible to agree to terms respecting the Established Church, the command of the army, and the Irish war. The chance of the king's success now appeared so doubtful, that many of his most devoted adherents, among whom were the Duke of Richmond and Lord Southampton, implored him to yield to any proposals which might yet save both the monarchy and the constitution. The king had at length reluctantly conceded that the command of the army should be vested for seven years in twenty persons, half of whom he should name, when all efforts for peace were abruptly defeated by news from Scotland that Montrose, whom Charles had made a marquis and governor-general of Scotland, had beaten the Covenanters, and broken the strength of the Campbells on February 2 at Inverlochy. Although such victories in a wild, scantily peopled country afforded little chance of permanent success, Charles suddenly broke off the negotiations. Several of his former friends, either now deeming the king's cause hopeless, or disgusted at his reliance on Montrose, returned to Westminster to pledge themselves never again to bear arms against the Parliament.¹

Cromwell had for some time desired to take the command of the army from Essex and Manchester, honest and brave generals, but induced to temporise by their constant desire to bring about the end of the war. Cromwell's superior skill as a general had been proved at Marston Moor, and he was a distinguished leader in the House of Commons of the increasing party of Independents who revolted against the bigotry of the Covenanters and supported freedom of worship: the right of every man to obey his own conscience in regard to religion, hitherto but a tenet of the philosophers, was now for the first time openly maintained. The first great victory won by the Independents was the passing of what was called 'the Self-denying Ordinance,' by which no member of Parliament could hold any military or civil office. Although the Lords opposed this measure, it passed in April, 1645. An exception was

¹ Hallam, i. 594. Large tracts of country were rendered desolate by the savage invaders, and at Inverlochy fifteen hundred of the clan Campbell are said to have been slain.

immediately made in favour of Cromwell, whose services were imperatively required. The Earls of Essex and Manchester resigned their commissions, and Sir Thomas Fairfax was summoned from the North to the House of Commons, where with thanks for his past services the commission of general-in-chief was given him. Numerous Royalists now despaired of the king's cause; but it was still paramount in the West, in nearly the whole of Wales, and in several of the midland towns. The gross excesses committed by the ill-disciplined troops of Prince Rupert had made them formidable even to Royalists, and the inhabitants of some of the southern counties were led to form associations for self-defence and retaliation, which, owing to the simple arms used by the country people, were called the bands of 'clubmen.' Encouragement was at first given to this league by neighbouring gentlemen, but the numbers of the clubmen soon aroused so much apprehension, that Parliament declared all those who took up arms without authority guilty of treason.¹ At the beginning of March the king parted with his eldest son, whom he sent into the West of England under the care of Hyde, Capel, and Colepepper, directing them, in case of his own destruction, to facilitate the escape of the prince to the continent. It was a final parting.

On June 14 the king personally engaged in the decisive battle fought at Naseby in Northamptonshire, where, once again, the fierce impetuosity of Prince Rupert scattered the left wing of the Parliamentary army, upon which he left the field to pursue the fugitives, while, as before at Marston Moor, Cromwell secured the victory. In vain Charles used every effort to rally his troops, assuring them that victory was still within their power; they fled from the field, and the king was most reluctantly compelled to retire upon Leicester, leaving his artillery, his standard and baggage on the field. Even his private correspondence was captured. Insecure at Leicester, Charles retired to Hereford, and thence to Cardiff, amidst the continual tidings of fresh disasters. Carlisle, Pontefract, and Scarborough, which had defied the efforts of their opponents for eighteen months, now surrendered. Many Royalists, including even Prince Rupert, so long the advocate of war, now pressed the king to listen to the terms offered by Parliament.

But Charles was still full of hope, relying on the 'gallantry of Montrose, and on 'an imaginary army of twenty thousand men from Ireland.'² On August 18, but two months after his

¹ Lingard, x. 152.

² Ib., x. 157.

defeat at Naseby, he wrote to Secretary Nicholas, charging him so to recruit his strength 'in men and arms that it may be a lusty stock for a next year's army;' and calling his condition 'miraculously good,' as the gentlemen of Yorkshire were hearty in his service.¹ But those sanguine hopes were speedily disappointed.

On September 10, Charles marched from Hereford to the relief of Bristol, then besieged by Fairfax, but learned on his way that Prince Rupert, who had promised a stout defence, had surrendered after three days' siege. Charles was irritated in the extreme at what he called this 'strange and most inexcusable surrender' of a well-fortified town, and wrote in anger to his nephew, revoking his commission, and commanding him to quit the kingdom. Rupert did not immediately obey that injunction. He prevailed upon the king to summon a court-martial, which decided that in the surrender of Bristol the prince was innocent of any guilt greater than indiscretion. High words, however, passed between the king and his nephews, and shortly afterwards both Rupert and Maurice obtained passes from Parliament, and quitted England, never more to fight for the king. In September the king also heard of the utter defeat of Montrose. In the last month of 1645, the king's prospects were indeed so low that Sir Edward Nicholas gave as reasons in favour of peace, that 'his Majesty has no army at all, no forces except in his garrisons; no means or money to satisfy his officers but the contributions of the country, which being wasted by the soldiers and extremely disaffected, was unable any longer to bear the heavy pressure put upon it.'²

The siege of Basing House in Hampshire, the seat of the loyal Marquis of Winchester, lasted longer than the siege of Sebastopol. It was stormed at length by Cromwell in October, 1645, and deserves notice as exhibiting the contrast in importance between such a residence and the mansion of a modern nobleman, as also the relative importance of fortifications at that day. The intrenchments round Basing House were a mile in extent, and the stores provided would have maintained the garrison for years. The marquis and nearly three hundred retainers were taken prisoners.³

Meantime, revelations in the private correspondence of the king and queen, taken on the fatal field of Naseby, greatly damaged the king's cause. From these letters it was evident

¹ See letter of Charles to Sir Edward Nicholas.—'Evelyn's Memoirs,' v. 142.

² See 'Evelyn's Memoirs,' v. 166.

³ See Carlyle's 'Cromwell,' i. 191-196; Hallam, i. 596-598.

that Charles had never been sincere in his concessions, but had constantly hoped to regain absolute power by the sword, and that, in spite of his repeated contrary assertions, he had urged the King of France and other continental rulers to send foreign forces to his aid. These letters were publicly read at Guildhall, and when published by order of Parliament greatly increased general indignation against the king. Still further proofs of his secret intrigues were afforded in the middle of October, when the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Tuam having been slain in a skirmish in Ireland, papers were found in his carriage which showed that during two years the king had been secretly in league with the chiefs of the Irish Catholics. The treaty was, however, unknown to the governing council, Charles being well aware that such a negotiation would be disapproved by most of the English Royalists. Secret instructions were sent by the king to Lord Herbert, son of the Marquis of Worcester, a nobleman of great loyalty and a fervent adherent of the Catholic Church, whom he created Earl of Glamorgan, and empowered to make such concessions to the Catholics as the lord-lieutenant would never have granted, in return for which a force of 10,000 men was to land in England, and two-thirds of the Irish Church revenues to be devoted to the king's aid. Strict secrecy was observed in this negotiation, and in all the papers there was some want of formality, designed to afford a pretext to deny their authenticity in case of discovery.¹ Under the necessity of vindicating himself to his Protestant subjects, Charles did not scruple to disavow the authority with which he had entrusted Glamorgan. That nobleman had obtained a force of 6,000 men, and was preparing to relieve Chester, when news reached him that Chester had fallen, that there was no longer a royal army in the West, and that the Prince of Wales had fled from England. Part of this force then joined Montrose in Scotland.

A strong reaction had lately shown itself in England against the exclusive bigotry of the Covenant. Cromwell and Fairfax had both urged the duty of religious toleration, and through the new members who had been chosen to supply the places in Parliament of absent Royalists, the Independent party had acquired a majority. Under these circumstances Charles hoped to profit by the dissension of his opponents, unaware that the great body of the Presbyterians were still attached to monarchy, while the Independents generally desired

¹ Lingard, x. 165.

the subversion of the throne. At the beginning of the year 1646, Charles repeatedly tried to negotiate, soliciting a personal conference at Westminster, offering to grant full toleration to every class of Protestants, to yield to the Parliament the command of the army during seven years, and to allow to them the next nomination of the lord-admiral, the judges, and other state officers. These were even greater concessions than those which Charles had rejected at Uxbridge; but their only effect was to call forth a Parliamentary ordinance, that in case the king should penetrate beyond the military defences of London, the officer of the guard should conduct him to St. James's Palace, allow of no access to his person, and imprison his followers. Notice was also given that Catholics and all who had borne arms for the king must leave London within six days, on pain of immediate arrest.¹ The army of Fairfax was advancing to lay siege to Oxford, where the king then was; and although that city, which had been strongly fortified, might have offered a long resistance, Charles was fearful of becoming a prisoner of war. Where, then, was he to find an asylum? The French envoy, Montreuil, had for some time been negotiating with the Scottish commissioners, that Charles might be received into their camp with assurance of protection, and Henrietta in her letters from Paris urged the king to repair thither. The Scots, fearful of the displeasure of the English Parliament; were undecided in their promises of support; and when Montreuil advised Charles to seek protection in their lines before Newark, he added, 'unless some better expedient could be devised.' Already Fairfax had reached Newbury; in three days the siege of Oxford would begin. Yielding to persuasion, the unhappy king left Oxford on the night of April 27, in disguise, attended only by his faithful adherent, Ashburnham, and Dr. Hudson, a clergyman. Their wanderings bear witness to the king's irresolution. They came as near London as Harrow, and Charles is said to have longed to enter the city, but to have been conquered by his fears. He waited two or three days at Downham, inquired eagerly for news of Montrose, and sought a vessel in which he might proceed to Scotland or Newcastle. But the hazard of such an attempt was great, and Montreuil repeated his advice in favour of the Scottish camp. Wearied by doubts and difficulties, Charles finally, on May 5, 1646, allowed himself to be conducted by Montreuil to the encampment before Newark. A

¹ Lingard, x. 174-175.

memorandum has been found, expressing the king's intention to let Montrose know upon what conditions he went to the Scots' army, and hoping that he would instantly march to join them.¹ But the heads of the Scottish army were totally averse to Montrose. The Earl of Leven affected surprise at the king's arrival, which he immediately announced to the Parliaments at Westminster and Edinburgh. A guard was placed on the king's apartments, and, although he was treated with respect, Charles soon found that he was a prisoner. Anxious to avoid a rupture with the English Parliament, the Scots soon afterwards broke up their camp before Newark, and proceeded with the king to Newcastle. Charles authorised the surrender of the few fortresses which still bore the royal banner; Oxford and Worcester opened their gates, and Fairfax granted favourable terms to the remains of the royal army.²

The last force which took the field at this time in the king's favour, under the command of Sir Jacob Astley, had been defeated on March 22, at Stowe; after which Astley is reported to have said to his conquerors, 'You have done your work and may go play, unless you choose to fall out among yourselves.'³ The chance of profiting by the dissensions of his opponents was now the unhappy king's only remaining hope. The last castle which surrendered was that of Ragland, the seat of the aged Marquis of Worcester, father of Lord Glamorgan. His death followed soon afterwards, and as his estate was sequestered, the House of Lords ordered payment of the expenses of his funeral. The Earl of Essex moreover had died; Parliament had voted him a large pension at the time when he surrendered the command of the army, and defrayed the expenses of his funeral, which was attended by both Houses, out of the public purse.⁴

The Scottish Presbyterians were still attached to the race of their own kings, but were as bigoted in their adherence to the Covenant as was Charles in his devotion to Prelacy. By direction of the Scottish Parliament, Mr. Henderson, one of their principal ministers, attempted to convert the king. Charles is said to have sustained his part in the controversy with dignity and spirit, refusing to sanction the Presbyterian mode of worship, even although the Scots offered to fight for

¹ Evelyn, v. 171.

² The king's letter permitting the surrender of Oxford is dated 'Newcastle, May 16, 1646,' and was read to the lords and gentlemen in that city on June 20.—Evelyn's 'Memoirs.'

³ See 'Memoir of Fairfax,' by Hartley Coleridge.

⁴ Lingard, x. 153, note.

him on that condition. On July 23 he received proposals of peace from the Parliament; but the terms were the most humiliating yet offered, requiring him to accept the Covenant, to abolish episcopacy, to surrender entirely to Parliament the command of the army for twenty years, and to exclude Royalists from offices of trust. The queen urged him to submit even to these harsh conditions, and Montreuil travelled to Newcastle in order to advise compliance, but Charles only renewed his request to be admitted to a conference at Westminster. Montrose had received the king's directions to disband his troops, and had set sail for France at the beginning of September. He proceeded to Paris to offer his services to Queen Henrietta, but did not receive from her the cordial reception due to his loyal exertions for the king.¹

It appears that throughout this summer Charles retained the hope of final restoration to power by means of an Irish army, and the terms which he offered Glamorgan in July were inconsistent with his Protestant character. He sent to Ireland two very opposite messages. By the one, which was openly delivered through the Scottish secretary, he commanded the Marquis of Ormond to break off the treaty with the Irish Catholics; by the second message, sent secretly through France to Glamorgan, he declared that he was willing to make any concessions to the Catholic bishops, if by their assistance he could strengthen his cause. For this object he offered to 'pawn his kingdoms' (kingdoms no longer in his power), and to satisfy the desires of the Pope's Nuncio.² But the king's hopes were again completely frustrated, when at the close of this year, 1646, after a negotiation with the Parliament, the Marquis of Ormond resigned his authority over Dublin Castle and all other fortresses, receiving from Parliament a sum of money and security for his estates.

Cornwall had surrendered to the troops of Fairfax, upon which the Duke of Hamilton regained his liberty. It might have been supposed that an imprisonment of more than two years would have extinguished the loyalty which Charles had so vindictively distrusted; but Hamilton was no sooner released from confinement than he came to London, eager by all possible means to rescue his unfortunate master. Renewing his homage at Newcastle, he employed all his efforts to induce the Scottish Parliament to intercede in the king's favour. Charles was induced by an embassy from Edinburgh to agree that the

¹ Cuet's 'Memoir of Montrose,' pp. 523-524.

² Lingard, x. 189. The letter of Charles to Glamorgan is most urgent.

Presbyterian forms should be established in all the English dioceses except five; but concessions which appeared fair in the view of moderate men were scouted by the fierce adherents of the Covenant as insufficient, and they had reason to doubt the king's sincerity.¹ The English were very weary of the Scottish army, and declared that the right of disposing of the king's person belonged to the English Parliament; the Scots replied that Charles was also King of Scotland, they had therefore an equal right to decide concerning his destination: the discussion became pointed and urgent. The sum promised by the English Parliament as an allowance for the Scottish army when they entered England to assist their cause was still unpaid; it was determined immediately to defray that debt, and to require that the army should return over the border, leaving the king in England under the charge of Commissioners sent from London, who should conduct him to the royal domain of Holmby, near Northampton.

The sum of £200,000 was immediately raised, and transported to the North of England under military escort. The Scots received at Northallerton half that sum; the second payment was made after the king had been delivered up.² The news of his projected removal came suddenly upon Charles on January 15, when engaged in a game at chess; he finished the game, and attempted to uphold his dignity as a free agent by declaring that on the arrival of the commissioners he would inform them of his wishes; but there appeared no alternative but submission, and the Parliament of Edinburgh had already consented that the English should have the sovereign in their keeping. Charles accordingly left Newcastle, escorted by a regiment of cavalry. The journey was performed slowly, and numbers of people flocked to behold the king, whom they now viewed with renewed interest and compassion. At the entrance of Nottingham the train was joined by General Fairfax, who knelt and kissed the king's hand, and rode through the town by his side, a sign of respect which much gratified him. When, on arriving at Holmby on the 16th, Charles beheld a large gathering of the respectable people of the neighbourhood, he evinced pleasure at so favourable a reception. With the exception of that perverse religious bigotry which required the king to take part in religious services which he disapproved, his treatment at Holmby was kind and liberal. His correspondence, indeed, was restricted, and intercourse with attached friends was forbidden, but he

¹ Guizot, ii. 185-189.

² Lingard, x. 187.

was served with all the ceremonial to which he had been accustomed, occasionally invited the commissioners to accompany him in his walks, and amused himself with games at chess or bowls.

Meantime the contest for supremacy between Parliament and the army was increasing in violence. The House of Commons passed a vote for disbanding all the troops not needed for the Irish service or garrisons, whilst petitions were sent up to the House from the army demanding their pay, declaring that the Irish service ought not to be imposed on those who were unwilling to go thither, and asserting that when they became soldiers they did not cease to be defenders of the freedom of their country.

Cromwell, who both attended the sittings of Parliament and exercised increasing influence over the army, had long remonstrated against compulsory subscription to the Covenant. His principle that Government 'should take no notice of opinions,' although quite opposed to that of the ruling party, was daily gaining ground among the military. John Milton, not yet known as a poet, had published a pamphlet in favour of the free utterance of opinions, which the Presbyterian clergy endeavoured in vain to suppress.¹ The Parliament, now distrustful of the army, was seeking to gain additional strength by a closer alliance with the king, and had designed to bring him to the royal residence of Oatlands, near London, when the news reached them that on June 3 a detachment of troops, commanded by Cornet Joyce, had carried him off from Holmby, and that he was then in the power of the army. At ten o'clock on the previous night Joyce had appeared at Holmby, and imperiously demanded an interview with the king, whom he required to leave the castle under his escort on the following morning.

To the king's inquiry whether Sir Thomas Fairfax authorised this measure, Joyce replied that he obeyed the commands of the army, which of course included their general. The king, having been consulted respecting the choice of his next residence, was at his own request taken to Newmarket. Fairfax disapproved of this proceeding, and sent two regiments of cavalry with orders to conduct the king back to Holmby; but Charles refused to accompany them, not being sorry, as it appeared, to change the power by which he was detained a prisoner, and hoping always that the dissensions of his enemies

¹ Carlyle's 'Cromwell,' i. 148. The title of Milton's pamphlet was 'A Speech for the Liberty of Unlicensed Printing.'

might lead to his liberation.¹ Cromwell denied that he had instigated this forcible removal, but it was believed to have been his act. He now joined the army encamped near Cambridge, which soon afterwards began its march towards London, conducting the king. On their way the officers received addresses from the freeholders of several counties who were dissatisfied with the conduct of Parliament, and appealed to the heads of the army as those at present in power. Two military councils had lately been formed; the one consisting of officers, the other of agents, or agitators, chosen by the soldiers, and Fairfax had exerted himself in vain to appease the turbulence shown towards the Parliament. The army, not contented with stating their own grievances, demanded the reform of both Parliament and Constitution, and expressly required the prosecution of eleven hostile members of the House of Commons. The Parliament felt itself unable to protect the accused members, who accordingly withdrew. Thus yielding to military dictation, 'the legislative power of England,' says Hallam, 'may be said to have fallen.' From this hour till that of the Restoration it had 'never more than a precarious gleam of existence, perpetually interrupted by the sword.'²

The Parliament endeavoured to conciliate the army, appointed commissioners to treat with the officers, and stipulated that the king should not be brought within a certain distance of London. Fairfax accordingly withdrew his troops some miles further from the capital, and appointed commissioners to treat with the Parliament.

In respect of the rights of conscience, Charles was treated with far more liberality by the officers than he had been by the Presbyterian commissioners. Two of his chaplains were allowed to officiate, and some of his old adherents were also admitted to his presence. The three youngest of the royal children had been placed by Parliament at Sion House, under the care of the Earl of Northumberland, and when the king expressed his desire to see them, Fairfax gladly obtained the permission. The interview took place at Maidenhead; the people showed their sympathy by scattering flowers before them, and the authorities allowed the king to enjoy his children's company for two days at his temporary residence at Caversham, near Reading.³ London was now agitated by a fresh outburst of Royalist feeling. At meetings of the citizens and apprentices it was urged that the king should be reinstated in power, and a

¹ Guizot, ii. 215.

² 'Constitutional History,' i. 625.

³ Guizot, ii. 227.

petition to that effect was signed by numbers, copies of which were circulated throughout the kingdom.

Meantime, proposals were made to the king by the military council, which were in some respects more moderate than those lately offered by Parliament. Charles was required to surrender for ten years the command of the army and the choice of the chief officers of state, to allow seven of his late advisers to remain in banishment, and to confer no civil power on either the orthodox or Presbyterian clergy, or upon the peers whom he had lately created. Other stipulations were added less personally affecting the king, respecting a more equal representation of the people, and a reduction of taxes. But the dissensions between the Parliament and the army had again inspired Charles with a fatal confidence, and he had written to the queen of his renewed hopes. He persisted in the belief that neither party could triumph unless aided by his name and authority, and he therefore refused the proffered terms of negotiation. 'Sire,' said his loyal adherent, Sir John Berkeley, 'your Majesty speaks as if still possessing powerful resources of which I know nothing.'¹

The king was implored by his friends to write immediately such a friendly letter to the generals as might lead to a settlement, but he hesitated, saying there was no need of haste. When, after much delay, Charles at last consented to sign the proposed letter, it was already too late.

Only a few weeks after the submission of the Commons to the army, a violent London mob at the door of the House so much terrified part of the assembly, that they adjourned, and the speakers of both Houses—the Earl of Manchester and Lenthall—with several peers and a large number of commoners, took flight from Westminster to throw themselves on the protection of the army.

Fairfax was closing upon London, and Presbyterian tumults were quelled by the sense of his power.

During the absence of the speakers, a vote was passed for the king to be invited to Westminster; but this was entirely reversed when, on August 6, Fairfax entered the city on horseback with a military procession, amidst which were carriages containing the peers and commoners who had claimed his protection. As they passed through London the lord mayor and common council offered their congratulations on the restored peace within the city, and Fairfax himself conducted each speaker to his place in Parliament. Although the numbers on

¹ Guizot, ii. 238.

divisions still showed that the Presbyterians in the House of Commons nearly equalled their opponents, it was evident that the real power of command now rested with the army, mainly directed by Cromwell, who followed two days afterwards with the rest of the army and secured perfect order in the metropolis.¹

The king was then (August 24) transferred to the palace of Hampton Court, where he was frequently allowed the company of his children, and the pleasure of hunting, on his promise not to attempt his escape; also the privilege, which he most especially valued, of holding free correspondence with the queen at Paris. At the request of the Scottish commissioners, the proposals which had been so lately offered to the king were again submitted to his consideration, and he expressed his readiness to treat both with the Parliament and the army. A 'grand committee' was appointed, 'to take the whole matter into consideration.' The superior officers appear to have earnestly endeavoured to accommodate matters; but repeated proofs of the king's duplicity, and the increasing distrust and disaffection in the army, led them at length to break off the negotiation. Colonel Ireton, Cromwell's son-in-law, who had been inclined to trust the king, declared, in conversation with Colonel Hutchinson, that he found that Charles 'had no real intention to the people's good, but to prevail by existing factions, to regain by art what he had lost in fight.'² In fact, Charles, according to his custom, was seeking to flatter the officers while he treated with those of the opposite party, from whose aid he hoped for complete success.

Lord Capel, one of the most distinguished royal commanders, who had been lately allowed by Parliament to return, the Marquis of Ormond, and the Scottish commissioners, had been in communication with the king, and a plan was formed, of which Cromwell gleaned information, that the Scots should invade England in the spring, while Capel should summon the English Royalists to rise once more on the king's behalf. Cromwell, in fact, complained to Ashburnham of the incurable duplicity of his master, who, whilst soliciting the aid of the army, was plotting its destruction.³ The demand of equal rights for all, and of the abolition of all restrictions on the

¹ Hallam (i. 625) clearly explains the importance of this subjection of Parliament to the military power. The mob appears to have been composed of an unruly and tumultuous body of apprentices, who tried by violence to compel the House to rescind their late votes against the king.—Lingard, x. 211.

² 'Memoir of Colonel Hutchinson,' by his widow, p. 277.

³ Lingard, x. 218; Hallam, i. 627 and 630, notes.

liberty of the subject, had procured for certain enthusiasts the name of 'Levellers,' as they appeared to oppose all the distinctions of rank and property; this name, however, they constantly disclaimed. These extreme lovers of liberty looked with jealousy on the little court which surrounded the king at Hampton Court, and even reproached Cromwell with his friendly intercourse with Charles. During the autumn the representatives, or as they were styled, 'Agitators,' of eleven regiments, presented the general with papers explaining their desire for a new Constitution under a reformed House of Commons, without naming any king or House of Lords. Colonels Pride and Rainsborough advocated these bold proposals, but they were decidedly opposed by Cromwell and Ireton. Prudent Republicans, like Colonel Hutchinson, were totally averse to the levelling of all distinctions of rank, and to entrusting the army with the preservation of order. The violent language used by these men against the king transpired at Hampton Court, and Charles was urged by his friends to seek safety by flight, yet it was difficult to determine in which direction. On the evening of November 11, Charles, accompanied by Sir John Berkeley and Ashburnham, left Hampton Court and crossed the river at Thames Ditton. They lost their way in the darkness, and it was daybreak when they mounted their horses, still without any fixed plan, but proceeding in a southerly direction. The king passed the next night at the residence of the Countess of Southampton, at Titchfield, whilst his companions crossed over to the Isle of Wight, to sound the feelings of the governor, Colonel Hammond, the nephew of one of the royal chaplains. When they left Titchfield, another plan occurred to the king, and he sent a trusty messenger to inquire at Southampton for a ship. Entertaining that hope, which might, could it have been realised, have saved him from destruction, it was with a pang of disappointment that Charles saw Ashburnham return accompanied by Colonel Hammond and another officer, and perceived that he had no choice but to place himself under their direction. The governor conducted the king to Carisbrook Castle, near Newport, gave orders that he should receive respectful attention, and acquainted Parliament with his arrival. The news of the king's escape had meantime much increased the violence of the Levellers, and for a time their anger against Cromwell threatened danger to his life. Seven regiments were summoned to Ware, in Hertfordshire, and on November 15, were confronted by Fairfax and Cromwell. A conciliatory remonstrance prepared in the name of General Fairfax was read to these troops,

who mostly replied by acclamations and promises of obedience ; but one regiment marched upon the ground unsummoned and insubordinate, the men wearing papers round their hats with the words, 'The people's freedom and the soldiers' rights.' Cromwell, perceiving the danger of his position, darted into the ranks to seize the ringleaders. His intrepidity daunted the mutineers ; one man was immediately shot, and two others tried and condemned by a council of officers, several more being reserved as pledges for the submission of their comrades.¹ Although the mutiny was thus arrested, Cromwell took pains to allay the discontent of the soldiery and to reconcile the Republicans to himself.

The unfortunate king meantime resumed his secret intrigues. Through one of the queen's chaplains he tried to induce the Scottish commissioners to relax their stringency with regard to the Covenant. He sent Sir John Berkeley to solicit a personal interview with Cromwell, and addressed a letter to Parliament, with offers of larger concessions than had been previously proposed. The Parliament had prepared four bills to which they required the king's assent before allowing a personal treaty. The Scots appear to have felt the disgrace attending their surrender of the king at Newcastle, and their commissioners, the Earl of Lanark and the Earl of Lauderdale, dissuaded him from acceding to the bills proposed.

The result of their negotiation at Carisbrook was a secret treaty by which a Scottish army should enter England, in order to restore the king to his freedom and dignity, in the confident expectation that the invasion would be supported by Royalist risings in England.

Animated by these hopes, Charles refused assent to the bills, and Parliament resolved, with the concurrence of the army, that no more addresses be sent to the king, and that 'any one proposing further negotiation be held guilty of high treason.'²

An attempt which Charles made to escape in a vessel which had been sent by the queen having been prevented by Colonel Hammond's vigilance, his imprisonment became more strict, but he still found means to correspond with Royalist friends, with the queen at Paris, and with his second son, the Duke of York, then at St. James's, but who soon afterwards escaped in disguise to Holland.

At the beginning of the civil war there had been no intention to deprive him of the throne, still less to overturn the

¹ Lingard, 224.

² Lingard, 227 ; Hallam, 633.

monarchy. But, by degrees, distrust of his designs, the irritation caused by the sufferings of the war, successive failures in attempted reconciliations, and the dread of retaliation, all promoted republican principles in the powerful faction whose chief bond of union had come to be their determination to dethrone the king.¹

Discontent was general in the country. The subordination of Parliament, nominally the supreme authority, to a military council; the continued captivity of the king, and the vote forbidding all further interposition on his behalf, made the great body of the people apprehensive lest a military despotism should succeed the monarchy. Petitions were sent from various public bodies, praying that the army should be disbanded, and the king restored to his capital. Other signs of a Royalist reaction, earnestly promoted by the Presbyterian ministers, induced Parliament to retrace its steps. It passed a resolution that no change should be made in the government of the realm by king, lords, and commons; at the same time revoking the former resolution not to allow of any personal treaty with the king. It even restored to their seats the eleven members to whom the army had so violently objected in the previous year.²

The citizens, in return, pledged themselves to live and die with the Parliament. 'The fugitive sheets of this year,' says Hallam, 'bear witness to the exulting and insolent tone of the Royalists,' already anticipating a triumph over Fairfax and Cromwell.³

On the death of Lord Fairfax, in March, 1648, Sir Thomas succeeded to his title; he remained in his post of command, and his services were soon required to repress several Royalist risings, the effect of which was but to render the king's doom inevitable. The Mayor of Pembroke, who had declared for the king, was joined by some of the disbanded forces; but these were soon subdued on the arrival of Cromwell with five regiments, although Pembroke Castle detained the general more than six weeks before its walls. On June 1, Lord Fairfax was engaged for six hours in the town of Maidstone, where two hundred of the Royalists fell in the streets, and four hundred were made prisoners. Those who escaped crossed the Thames, and being joined by Lord Capel and Sir Charles Lucas, shut

¹ Hallam, i. 636-637.

² Lingard, x. 234; Hallam, i. 634.

³ Hallam, i. 633, note. The cry of 'God and the King,' raised by the disturbers of the peace subdued by Fairfax, showed the strong popular feeling in the king's favour.

themselves up in Colchester, which resisted all the attacks of Fairfax for eleven weeks.

About the time of the outbreak in Kent, the English fleet of six men-of-war had defied their commanders, hoisted the royal colours, and sailed to Helvoetsluys in readiness to receive the young Duke of York as their commander-in-chief. As soon as the Prince of Wales heard that the fleet had declared itself Royalist, he hastened to take the command, and while cruising about the Channel was watching the wavering temper of Parliament and the city. Before the king left Hampton Court, a plan had been formed by the Royalists, that the Duke of Hamilton should invade England with a powerful army, and that, at the same time, a general rising of the king's friends should take place in every part of England. But Hamilton's intentions were for some time baffled by the ardent Covenanters, the party headed by the Earl of Argyle, who deprecated the concessions lately made in the king's favour.

The Royalists in Wales rose, and were subdued, before the Duke of Hamilton, in July, began his invasion, followed by Monroe with 3,000 veterans from the Scottish army in Ireland, and by Sir Marmaduke Langdale, who had fought at Naseby, and now commanded 4,000 high-spirited Cavaliers. Colonel Lambert, the Parliamentary general in the North, retired before the Royalists, until joined by Cromwell with the regiments which had been victorious in Wales.

At Preston, on August 17, Cromwell's victory was complete, although the forces which he commanded did not exceed 9,000, not half the number of the enemy united. The Duke of Hamilton was taken prisoner shortly afterwards. The Earl of Holland, whose vacillations had caused him to lose the esteem of both parties, at the same time made a feeble attempt to raise London for the king, but was defeated and taken prisoner. The young Duke of Buckingham was slain in the skirmish at Kingston; his brother, Lord Francis Villiers, escaped to the continent.¹

From Preston, Cromwell advanced to Scotland, restraining his soldiers from all pillage or disorder. So great was the opposition between the different Scottish factions that, after the defeat of Hamilton, Cromwell was welcomed at Edinburgh by the party of Argyle, and Berwick was surrendered to the English.

Every attempt in the king's favour failed. Colchester at length surrendered on August 28. The fate of three noble-

¹ Lingard, x. 240.

men, Goring, Capel, and Hastings, was reserved for the judgment of Parliament; Sir George Lisle and Sir Charles Lucas, eminent Royalist commanders, suffered death, an act of severity which sullied the general character of humanity ascribed to Fairfax. Anxious hopes and bitter disappointment must have been felt by the king concerning these enterprises, but still greater at the neglect of the private message which he sent this summer to the Prince of Wales after his embarkation, urging that before the fleet left the English coast an attempt should be made to free him from captivity. Had the ships which were nominally under the prince appeared before the Isle of Wight, Charles might possibly have been rescued; but the sailors were really the masters of the fleet, and their desire was to fight the Parliamentary squadron under the Earl of Warwick, who eluded all attempts to force an engagement. On August 30, on the plea of want of provisions, the prince was compelled to return to the coast of Holland, leaving to his father no chance of rescue unless by negotiation with his adversaries.¹

Petitions sent to the House of Commons at this time showed but too plainly the designs of the Republican party. The House was urged to constitute itself the sole ruling power, and at the same time to allow of such reforms in its constitution as would better enable it to represent the people. Voices were heard boldly asking 'the use of a king and of a House of Lords,' and insisting on the natural equality of men. Silent to such appeals, the moderate party still possessed sufficient strength to attempt yet another negotiation with Charles through a commission of five lords and ten commoners, all of whom, except Sir Harry Vane, and perhaps Lord Say, were favourable to peace. On September 15 these envoys arrived at Newport, to which place the king was allowed to remove, and there he was suffered to collect around him his servants, his chaplains, and any counsellors who had taken no part in the war. Charles had promised that during the forty days allotted to this conference, and for twenty days afterwards, he would make no attempt to escape.

The king appeared before the commissioners with dignity; he was seated on a raised dais, with his advisers standing behind his chair, and his venerable and thoughtful countenance made a favourable impression even on those prepossessed against him. But the old difficulty arising from the king's habits of evasion still obstructed this last attempt at

¹ Lingard, x. 241.

negotiation. At one time he made concessions from which he afterwards tried to escape; and it appears that, after all the warnings which he had received, he was still deceived by hopes of an ultimate triumph.

The Marquis of Ormond, who had taken refuge at Paris, was preparing to return to Ireland, supported by assistance from France, to make peace with the Irish Catholics, and to carry on war against the English Parliament; by his means there appeared yet a hope for the king's escape and restoration. Letters which Charles sent to Ormond contain the words, 'Obey my wife's orders, not mine, till I inform you that I am free from constraint.' The king also wrote to Sir William Hopkins that the principal concessions to which he had agreed were made in the confident hope of his speedy escape.¹ One of the letters from Charles to Ormond, however, fell into the hands of the Parliament. In that assembly the rival factions were struggling hard for the mastery. The army issued the most threatening denunciations, and on November 18 the House of Commons received a long 'remonstrance' from an assembly of officers, urging that the king, as 'the capital and grand author of all the troubles which the kingdom had endured, should be speedily brought to justice;' that a time should be fixed for the dissolution of the present Parliament; and that in future the sovereign should be *elected* by a reformed House of Commons freely chosen by the people.

A stormy debate ensued on the reading of this paper. The more violent Independents, who from the first disapproved of the Newport negotiation, proposed a vote of thanks for the advice of the officers, but the Presbyterians obtained a considerable majority against it.² The commissioners at Newport were now urged to bring their negotiations to a speedy conclusion; and so great was their reluctance to depart without having obtained any satisfactory concessions, that they stipulated that Sundays and holidays should not be counted. They had been instructed to insist on the terms offered to the king at Hampton Court, to most of which Charles assented, yet still contended against abolishing the episcopal order, or alienating the lands of the bishops, stipulating also that his followers be allowed to compound for their delinquency. At length, on November 27, when Charles could be no longer blind to his personal danger, 'when the time was run to the last minute,'³

¹ Guizot, ii. 335, with references to the king's letters published in the third edition of Wagstaff's 'Vindication of the Royal Martyr.' Also Carlyle's 'Cromwell,' i. 323. Lingard, x. 243, note.

² Lingard, x. 245-246.

³ *Ib.*

he consented to leave the trial of his imprisoned adherents to the mercy of Parliament, to suspend the functions of the bishops, and, until religion should be settled by the consent of both the king and the two Houses, to vest their lands in the crown. When, on November 28, the commissioners took their final leave, Charles addressed them with a solemn sadness which showed his full comprehension of his position. The concessions extorted with such difficulty were far from satisfactory to the Independents. When the Presbyterians obtained a majority in favour of accepting them, Colonel Hutchinson entered his protest with four other members. 'If the king be restored,' said he, 'the people will reap no fruit but a confirmation of bondage. It had been a thousand times better never to have struck one stroke in the quarrel, than after victory to yield up a righteous cause; the object was to *extirpate prelacy*, not to *lease* it.'¹

Colonel Hammond, governor of the Isle of Wight, was summoned to Windsor, and left with the commissioners. On November 30 the king, with a few of his attendants, was removed to Hurst Castle, in Hampshire, situated on a rock, and only joined to the mainland by a long narrow causeway.

Parliament were engaged on the second day in discussing the negotiations of Newport, when they were informed of the king's forcible removal to this prison. The news was received with indignation, and the debate was the longest and most animated which had ever occurred in Parliament.

When daylight ended, it was proposed to continue the discussion by torchlight, but that was objected to on the ground that many aged members, the majority of whom favoured the king, would be incapable of sitting until the time of voting.² The king now found a defender in an old adversary, Prynne, the victim of Laud's cruelty, and afterwards Laud's persecutor, but who, after alluding to his own past sufferings as a sufficient pledge against undue attachment to royalty, warned Parliament against allowing itself to become the servile instrument of a domineering army. Prynne was raised by his disinterested love of justice above the prejudices of his sect, and the House listened attentively to his appeal. It was at last decided by a majority of thirty-six that the king's offers furnished sufficient ground for the settlement of the kingdom.³

¹ Mrs. Hutchinson's words, 'Memoirs,' 301.

² Guizot, ii. 351.

³ This memorable debate continued by successive adjournments three days and a whole night, and the last division took place at nine in the morning of December 5.

But this victory led to the destruction of the moderate party. The military directors alone possessed the real power, and to save what the enthusiasts of the party called 'the good cause,' they did not scruple once more at a signal violation of law. The names of the members who had just voted were canvassed, and before Fairfax knew of the intention the troops were in movement.

Two regiments commanded by Colonels Pride and Rich were placed before the House of Commons, and when those members arrived whose exclusion had been decreed, they were forbidden to enter the doors. In spite of violent opposition on the part of many, forty-one were thus excluded, and on the next day many more. The minority thus became a majority.¹ Cromwell, who had been detained at the siege of Pontefract Castle, one of the strongest inland fortresses, entered London the day following the expulsion of the friends of peace, and he went direct to the House of Commons, where he was received with the warmest acclamations. He took up his residence at Whitehall in the royal apartments. The forebodings of Prynne were already realised. The power rested in the army, and the remains of the Parliament became but the medium of their will. All the late Acts passed by the House in favour of negotiation with the king were now annulled, without even the form of consulting the House of Lords, whilst fresh petitions demanded the trial of the king, and a detachment of soldiers was sent to Hurst Castle to conduct him to Windsor. It was on the night of December 17 that Charles was awakened by the fall of the drawbridge and the entrance of a troop of horse. Colonel Harrison had been appointed to conduct the royal captive to Windsor Castle, where he arrived on December 23. Hitherto, during the whole time of his imprisonment, the king had been constantly served with the usual state ceremonials; now at Windsor, these were for the first time wanting. The soldiers brought his meat to table uncovered, the cup was no longer presented on the knee. This change much affected the king, who determined in future to take his meals in private.² The fortitude which he displayed throughout all his trials gained the respect of all admitted to his presence; but even yet he was supported by the hope that his enemies only intended to extort from him the resignation of his crown. He relied on the interposition of the Scots and of foreign powers, and the attachment of a great part of his English subjects.³ 'There had

¹ This was called in the slang of the time, 'Pride's purge.'—Lingard, x. 250.

² Lingard, x. 257.

³ Ib.

long been only one course open before him,' says Hallam, 'either for safety or for honour—the abdication of his royal office;' but, although he had sought to make his escape to France, he never seems to have proposed to resign the crown.¹

It had long been the officers' opinion that the king's life could not be preserved with safety. If he were restored to power they would be exposed to his vengeance, and so long as he remained in prison there would be a succession of plots in his favour. But when the House, under military inspiration, decided upon bringing the king to a public trial, appointing a committee to draw up the accusation, there were still a few members who dared to offer objections, seeking at least, if without further hope, to exempt themselves from so heavy a responsibility. They urged that a king's person ought to be held sacred; that history afforded no example of a sovereign who was compelled to plead before a court composed of his own subjects; that such an act of vengeance would but deepen the bleeding wounds of the country. On January 1, a vote passed the House, stating it to be high treason in the King of England to levy war against the Parliament and the kingdom. This was immediately followed by an ordinance, erecting a High Court of Justice to try the question whether Charles Stuart, King of England, had been guilty of the treason so described. To these proceedings the House of Lords, consisting on this occasion of only fourteen members, unanimously refused assent. They saw that the political extinction of the nobility would follow the fall of the sovereign. At this crisis they adjourned for a week. The House of Commons then declared that the people are the source of all just power, and passed an Act for the trial of the king, to be held at Westminster Hall on January 20.

On Friday, the 19th, Colonel Harrison arrived at Windsor, with a troop of cavalry, and the king was conveyed under his escort in a carriage drawn by six horses to St. James's Palace. One attendant only, his faithful Herbert, was allowed to remain, and carefully guarded him day and night.

The trial began on the following day, when the commissioners proceeded to Westminster Hall in state. A chair covered with crimson velvet was assigned to the president, John Bradshaw; before him on a table lay the sword and mace, and opposite the president was a chair to which the king was led by the sergeant-at-arms; the commissioners

¹ Hallam, i. 636.

were ranged on either side. Charles entered the hall with a firm step and dignified demeanour; he smiled with contempt while listening to the charge in which he was described as 'a tyrant, traitor, murderer, and a public and implacable enemy of the Commonwealth of England.' When required by the President to reply to these accusations, Charles asked by what authority he was now arraigned. As the King of England he acknowledged no superior on earth, and he would not lessen the dignity of the crown, which had been bequeathed to him by his ancestors. He declared that his cause was also the cause of the whole nation, for if force were allowed to change the fundamental laws of the kingdom, no man could be secure either of his liberty or his life. The president frequently interrupted the king's address. When charged 'in the name of the people of England, by whom he had been made king,' Charles replied that monarchy had been hereditary in England for nearly a thousand years. When accused in the name of Parliament, he asked where, then, were the Lords? The English constitution required the joint authority of the king, lords, and commons. Such was the substance of the king's reply delivered on three successive days. The president would not suffer the jurisdiction of the court to be questioned, and at last ordered the 'default and contempt of the prisoner' to be recorded.¹ As the trial proceeded day by day, the sympathy of the people for the king was increasingly shown, and a strong military force was kept under arms to suppress any demonstration of popular feeling. One day when the name of Fairfax was called, he being one of the commissioners, a female voice replied from the gallery, 'He has more wit than to be here;' and when, on another day, Bradshaw stated that the charge was brought against the king by the consenting voice of the people of England, the same voice exclaimed, 'No, not by one-tenth of the people.' A faint murmur of assent was audible, but was instantly suppressed, and the remarks were allowed to pass unnoticed when the speaker was found to be Lady Fairfax.²

When, on January 27, the court again assembled and the result could no longer be doubtful, the king earnestly entreated permission to confer with a committee of both Houses of Parliament. He asked, as he declared, a favour which would spare

¹ Lingard, x. 260.

² According to Lingard, it was on the first day of the king's trial that Lady Fairfax answered for her husband (x. 261); Carlyle, however, states that Fairfax sat among the judges on the first day only. Lady Fairfax's 'desperate loyalty' appears to have at times restrained her husband from free action.—Lingard and Mrs. Hutchinson.

them the commission of a great crime, and restore tranquillity to his people. The president was unwilling to allow the interruption; but when Colonel Downes, a member of the court, earnestly expostulated, directions were given for the king to withdraw, whilst the propriety of granting his request was the subject of eager debate for nearly an hour. Many were the questions, anxious were the conjectures, among the multitude, deep was the king's suspense, during that hour. It was conjectured that he intended to resign the crown to his eldest son, but it was then too late for such overtures. On the king's readmission, he was informed by the president that his request was refused, and he was not allowed to address the court.

After a recapitulation by Bradshaw of those principal acts of the reign on which the charges had been based, the clerk was desired to read the sentence which condemned the king to death 'by severing his head from his body.' The commissioners all rose to testify their concurrence. Even then, Charles made a last effort to obtain a hearing, but the guards hurried him from the hall. 'He does not seem, till the very last,' says Mr. Carlyle, 'to have fairly believed that they would dare to sentence him.' As the king proceeded in his carriage, the people were generally silent, or uttered prayers on his behalf; whilst the soldiers shouted 'Justice!' 'Execution!' But Lord Capel, the most highly esteemed of the Royalists captured at Colchester, had already sent a long letter to Cromwell, whom he regarded as the most powerful person in the country, using all possible arguments and entreaties against inflicting death on the king.

No answer was returned to this appeal.¹

Charles requested to be left in privacy with the Bishop of London, Dr. Juxon, who was allowed to attend him; and his young children had their last interview with their unfortunate father at St. James's Palace. The Princess Elizabeth was only twelve years of age, and the Duke of Gloucester but eight.

That intercession which Charles had expected from foreign rulers now failed him; indeed, most of the European princes awaited the catastrophe with indifference.

France was distracted by dissensions, and Queen Henrietta had given no encouragement to Montrose. During the late civil war the King of Spain had corresponded with the English Parliament. The Parliament of Scotland and the ambassadors

¹ Lord Capel's long letter to Cromwell is given by Lady Theresa Lewis in 'Lives from the Clarendon Gallery,' ii. 252.

from Holland, alone, made unavailing efforts to save the king's life.

It was not till the evening of the third day after their arrival that the ambassadors from the Hague obtained audiences of the two Houses of Parliament. In their company came a special messenger from the Prince of Wales, bringing two letters, one for the king; the other, addressed to Lord Fairfax, contained a blank sheet, subscribed with the name and sealed with the arms of the prince. 'Let the grandees of the army fill up this sheet with their conditions:' whatever they might be, they were granted already; his seal and signature were affixed.

It is unknown how far this offer affected the minds of those who had determined on their course, but it has been asserted by the friends of Fairfax that he endeavoured to postpone the fatal day.¹

The king may have derived some solace from learning that his son had not forgotten him in this extremity. It was indeed at the last hour that, by the indulgence of the colonel on duty, the prince's emissary was admitted, delivered the letter, and received the king's last message for his son. No longer disturbed by hopes and fears, Charles showed in these last days of his life the utmost fortitude. He slept for some hours on the night before January 30, rose early, and desired his attendant to dress him with care. After prayer with the Bishop of London, he walked across the park to Whitehall, attended by the colonel of the guards and Dr. Juxon, and his firm step and serene countenance impressed respect even on the soldiers who lined the long gallery which he had to traverse. An opening having been made at the end of the banqueting hall, the king stepped at once upon the scaffold, which was hung with black, where stood two masked executioners. Charles viewed the apparatus of death with dignified calmness. He wished to speak to the people, but the regiments of horse and foot which immediately surrounded the scaffold prevented his words from penetrating to the multitude beyond. Turning to the few persons near him, he denied that he had begun the civil war, saying that Parliament first claimed the command of the army, and had even issued commissions. He declared that he forgave all his enemies, even those who brought him to death; expressed his attachment to the Church of England, and called himself 'the martyr of the people.' After a few words from

¹ Lingard, x. 265. 'A fac-simile of the carte-blanche, with the signature of the prince, graces the title-page of the third volume of the "Original Letters," published by Mr. Ellis,' *ib.* see note.—Harleian MS., 6988.

the bishop, Charles laid his head upon the block and gave the signal to the executioner. His head was struck off at one blow. When the executioner held it up, saying 'This is the head of a traitor!' a deep groan burst from the people, but they were immediately dispersed by the cavalry. The king's body was placed in a coffin, and after remaining seven days at Whitehall, was interred in St. George's Chapel, Windsor, on February 6. The inscription on the coffin was simply, 'King Charles, 1648.'¹ The hearse was drawn by six horses covered with black trappings, and was followed by four carriages containing the Duke of Richmond, the Marquis of Hertford, the Earls of Southampton and Lindsay, and Bishop Juxon. The king's attached servants, Herbert and Mildmay, were allowed to direct the funeral, and the apartments of the young Duke of Gloucester were hung with black draperies.

Admiration of Charles's noble bearing in the last terrible scenes leads naturally to invective against those who brought him before a tribunal which had already forecast his destiny. But justice to some noble-minded men among the king's judges enforces the remembrance that many efforts for accommodation had been baffled by his double-dealing, and that his opponents had the greatest reason to apprehend his vengeance in case of the reaction which, nearly to the last, Charles continued confidently to anticipate. On the day of execution, before any courier had carried the news abroad, an ordinance was published declaring it high treason to name Charles Stuart, called Prince of Wales, or any other person, the late king's successor, or to give any person the title of king without the authority of Parliament.

On February 6, a long debate took place in the House of Commons, when, by forty-four voices against twenty-nine, it was decided that the House of Lords was 'useless and dangerous.' Only about five peers had of late attended the Upper House; they did not await the decision of the Commons, but adjourned 'till the next day,' and did not reassemble until April, 1660. They still retained their titles, and three peers—the Earls of Pembroke and Salisbury, and Lord Howard—condescended afterwards to take seats in the House of Commons.

The new Great Seal bore on one side the arms of England and Ireland, on the other, a representation of the House of Commons, and the words, 'The 1st year of Freedom, restored by the blessing of God.' It was held in trust by three commissioners.

¹ This was according to the 'Old Style.' The date of the king's death is now generally made 1649.

CHAPTER XXIX.

ENGLAND AS A COMMONWEALTH, AND CROMWELL'S
PROTECTORATE.

A.D. 1649—1660.

THE Independent party, in accordance with the recent declaration of the House, claimed for the representatives of the people in Parliament the sole right to administer the government of the country. Some persons, believing in the popular attachment to the principle of monarchy, advocated the immediate succession of the young Duke of Gloucester, or of the Princess Elizabeth, rejecting the elder members of the royal family, and with strict guarantees securing the just liberties of the people from future encroachment.¹ But this would have been merely the name of a monarchy, leaving all power to the director of the infant sovereign, while the triumphant party had decided on establishing a republic. The resolution of the Commons dispensing with the House of Lords was immediately followed by another abolishing the royal office.

But it was well known that what was now termed the English Parliament did not adequately represent the people. The triumph of the Independent party in August, 1647, was effected by military authority, and after Pride's forcible expulsion of the fifty-two Presbyterians (men the most distinguished by talent or influence), because they still desired to negotiate with the king, the House had been reduced from more than five hundred members to less than a seventh of that number.² 'Thus,' says Hallam, 'by military force, with the approbation of an inconsiderably small proportion of the people, the king was put to death; the ancient fundamental laws were overthrown, and a mutilated House of Commons, wherein very seldom more

¹ Lingard, x. 270.² Ib. 208, 274.

than seventy or eighty sat, was invested with the supreme authority.¹

‘Thirty thousand veteran soldiers guaranteed the mock Parliament they had permitted to reign.’

The late violent changes had, however, interfered but little with the general administration of order in the country, and the great body of the people scarcely felt the important alteration in the government. During the late commotions, the supreme authority had been administered in the name of the king by the two Houses of Parliament, aided by the committee of officers at Derby House; while now ‘the same authority was equally administered in the name of the people by one House only, with the advice of a Council of State.’² Six judges resigned after the king’s execution, the other six consented to hold office provided Parliament would announce its intention to maintain the fundamental laws of the kingdom. It agreed, and the promise was fulfilled. The Council of State, which was installed on February 17, consisted of forty-one members, comprising the heads both of the law and the army, five peers and many commoners, amongst whom Cromwell, Ireton, Bradshaw, and Morton were held in general respect.

The members of this council were required to take an oath approving the late changes, the king’s trial, the vote against the Scots with their English associates, and the abolition of monarchy and of the House of Lords. Fairfax and twenty-two others firmly but respectfully refused to take this oath. Among the dissidents was Sir Harry Vane, a leader among the Independents, who, after the exclusion of the Presbyterians by Pride, had retired to his country seat, but now rejoined the Parliament. To satisfy these remonstrants, the retrospective clauses were expunged, and Cromwell was content with a general promise of adherence to the Parliament and to Republican government.³

The object of Cromwell and his best friends now was to conduct the administration without a monarchy, maintaining complete toleration in respect of all religious opinions. But how would the Scots respond to these intentions, who had armed against the king in defence of their peculiar faith, but had scarcely to the last relinquished the hope that Charles would allow Prelacy to be succeeded by the Covenant? At the beginning of January, when the Scots first became aware of his approaching fate, a cry of indignation burst from every part of

¹ ‘Constitutional History,’ i. 625, 653–654.

² Lingard, x. 273.

³ Ib. 272; Forster’s ‘Memoir of Vane,’ 127.

their country on behalf of 'their native king.' The fair fame of Scotland was tarnished by the surrender of the king at Newcastle, and their commissioners in London were instructed to protest against the trial.

Three weeks elapsed after the death of Charles, before the English Parliament thought fit to reply to the protest from Scotland in self-vindication. But as soon as the news of the king's execution reached Scotland, their Parliament had determined its course of proceeding. On the next day, February 5, the Chancellor, attended by the members, proceeded to the cross in Edinburgh, and proclaimed Charles, the son of the deceased sovereign, king of the United Kingdom in the usual form; appending the proviso that before the young prince could exercise royal authority, he must assure the Scottish Parliament of his adhesion as well to the national Covenant of Scotland as to the solemn 'League and Covenant' between the two kingdoms.¹

In reply to the official communication sent from England, the Scottish commissioners hinted that the present was not a complete Parliament, objected to the change of government, and desired that no opposition should be raised to the lawful succession of Charles II. The Scots, as they protested, were free from the past guilt. After delivering this protest the commissioners hastened to Gravesend, that they might proceed without delay to Holland, in order to offer the Scottish crown to Prince Charles. But the English authorities prevented their embarkation, caused them to be arrested as national offenders, and at the beginning of March sent them under guard to the frontiers of Scotland.

The bold defiance of Scotland probably hastened the trial of those five prisoners, for which a High Court of Justice had been already established. The Duke of Hamilton, who had invaded England in the summer, was amenable to the English law as Earl of Cambridge; Lord Holland, after repeatedly changing his party, had attempted to raise London against the Parliament; Goring Earl of Norwich, Lord Capel, and Sir John Owen, were all concerned in the last attempt for the king's restoration; they had indeed been already condemned for treason against 'the supreme authority of the nation.' By a resolution of the House of Commons passed in November, Hamilton had been adjudged to pay a fine of £100,000, and the other four to undergo imprisonment for life, but on the triumph of the Independents the vote had been rescinded.² Great inte-

¹ Lingard, x. 284.

² Ib. p. 276.

rest was made to save the prisoners; all the cases were discussed in Parliament, and Goring was saved by the casting vote of the Speaker. The life of Owen was saved, apparently, because, being a stranger, without friends or interest, his case awakened the compassion of Colonels Hutchinson and Ireton. Hamilton, Holland, and Capel died on the scaffold, the first who died for adherence to the king's cause after the establishment of the Commonwealth.

The dangers threatening the new government were twofold, arising both from the adherents of monarchy, and from those lovers of liberty who held nearly all exercise of authority to be tyranny. 'Almost every man,' says Mrs. Hutchinson, 'was fancying a form of government, and angry that his invention took not place, and among these was John Lilburne, a turbulent-spirited man that never was quick in anything.' These words were no doubt correct; but it is impossible to deny the merit of Colonel Lilburne as a brave and conscientious man. In the late reign he had been punished by a cruel whipping through London, for having published a pamphlet against the order of bishops; yet showed himself so superior to resentment as to denounce the trial of the king, and to offer his services in the defence of Lord Capel and his fellow-prisoners. He now opposed with violence what he considered military tyranny, and his pamphlets, one of which was called 'England's New Chains Discovered,' excited an earnest appeal to Parliament against him. One of his writings was voted a libel, and he was imprisoned in the Tower.

One of the first acts of the Council of State was to appoint John Milton their Latin secretary, to correspond in that language with foreign states. Our great poet was then chiefly known as author of a pamphlet in which he argued that it was lawful, in certain cases, to depose, and even execute, a wicked ruler. His aid was now required in a matter much beyond the scope of ordinary diplomacy. Immediately after the execution of the king, a work was published, entitled 'Icon Basiliké,' which was said to have been written by Charles himself, and which described his thoughts and sufferings during the late war. It is said that fifty editions of this work were published in one year; it naturally aroused a widespread sympathy for the late king, and was read with eagerness in France and other countries.

Milton undertook to contradict the alleged authorship, and when a Dutch clergyman replied under the name of Salmasius, was directed by the council to refute his arguments. Milton's

replies to Salmasius received much praise on the continent, and Queen Christina of Sweden expressed high admiration of his reasoning. In one of these works Milton alluded with touching eloquence to his loss of sight, sacrificed, as he believed, to his assiduous labours in the Republican cause.¹

Meantime, the arrest of the Scottish commissioners could not long prevent the Scottish Parliament from communicating with their elected sovereign. Since the death of his father, Charles had resided in Holland under the protection of his brother-in-law, the Prince of Orange. He gave the name of privy council to the small court which had assembled round him, and which contained the representatives of different Scottish parties, all professing zeal on his behalf, yet divided by religious bigotry or former feuds. Thither came the Earl of Lanark, now Duke of Hamilton, after his brother's death, and the Marquis of Montrose, Hamilton's former enemy. The Earl of Cassilis joined this Royalist assembly with four other Scottish commissioners, and three deputies from the Church of Scotland. The latter indeed brought Charles the news that lately, at the petition of the Kirk, the Scottish Parliament had sent the old Marquis of Huntley to the scaffold, who had been concerned in the war for the royal cause in 1645.² Charles might well ask whether the king, like the Parliament, would be under the direction of the Kirk. The commissioners and others represented that subscription to the Covenant was indispensable; whilst Montrose and his English counsellors contended that by such an act he would offend all the friends of Episcopacy, exasperate the Independents, and remove all hope that the Roman Catholics would ever favour his cause. Whilst Charles was still hesitating concerning his answer, a deed of violence caused his immediate departure from the Hague. Although the Prince of Orange favoured the Stuarts, the States of Holland were on friendly terms with the English Parliament, and Dr. Dorislaus, a native of Holland, had been employed to draw up the indictment against the late king. He arrived on May 3, as envoy from the English government to the States. On the evening of his arrival, while supping at the inn, six men entered the room, dragged him from his chair, and murdered him on the spot. The assassins escaped,

¹ The authorship of the work entitled '*Icon Basiliké*,' at first ascribed to King Charles, was afterwards claimed by Mr. Gauden, a clergyman of Bocking, in Essex, whom Charles II. apparently rewarded both for his book and for his silence respecting it, by giving him the Bishopric of Exeter, and afterwards that of Worcester.—Lingard, x. note B; Hallam's '*Lit. History*,' iii. chap. vii.

² Lingard, x. 286.

but it was known that they were Scots, and nearly all followers of Montrose.

The English government threatened vengeance for this bloody act. By their orders, the body of Dorislaus was brought to London, and was interred at Westminster Abbey with great honour. Charles, before leaving the United Provinces to join his mother in France, replied to the Scottish commissioners that he had always been ready to secure the religious freedom and prosperity of Scotland, as well as the union of the kingdoms, but that their other demands were incompatible with his conscience and with his honour. As they acknowledged him to be their king, they were bound to obey and defend him, a duty which equally devolved upon the assembly of the Kirk, the Parliament, and the whole nation of Scotland.

From Ireland Charles received proposals much more consonant to his views. The Duke of Ormond had returned thither some time before the late king's death, hoping to join in the Duke of Hamilton's enterprise. Too late to aid in that incursion, he exerted himself in exciting the Royalist feelings of the Irish; Protestant Royalists took shelter in Ireland, and even the Scottish faction in Ulster were ready to make common cause with the Catholics against the Regicides. If Charles II. would come and be crowned in Ireland, the Irish declared that they would accept him as their king, without the Covenant which, like him, they abhorred.

Since the massacres of 1641 Ireland had been in great disorder. The conduct of the Irish soldiers who joined Montrose, and the fierce severity of the English Parliament when it refused to grant them quarter, had alike inflamed national animosities. The English government now determined to send over a force of 12,000 men, and the regiments for the service were chosen by ballot with perfect fairness. But the men refused to march, declaring that they would not leave England until satisfied that the liberty of the nation was more secure. A troop of horse refused obedience, and instead of marching out of London, took possession of the colours. Five of the ringleaders were sentenced to be shot, but only one, a young man named Robert Lockyer, who had served throughout the civil war and was much beloved in his regiment, suffered death for his offence. The people assembled in thousands at his funeral in Westminster; other signs, moreover, awakened apprehensions of a serious mutiny. Seven regiments, quartered in different places, had chosen their agents, and published their resolutions to act in concert, when Parliament commissioned

Lord Fairfax to take measures to suppress the disaffection. Fairfax and Cromwell traversed the disturbed districts, and endeavoured to restore order with the smallest possible sacrifice of life. Ten troops of horse, more than 1,000 strong, had marched from Salisbury to Burford, augmenting their numbers by the way, when their progress was arrested by Cromwell with double their numbers, and 400 of the mutineers were made prisoners. Three only suffered death; the others, after a short imprisonment, were restored to their former regiments.¹ Partial risings in the western counties were quickly suppressed, and the Parliament appointed June 7 as a day of thanksgiving. On that day Parliament, the Council of State, and the council of the army assembled at Christ Church, and were afterwards regaled at Grocers' Hall by invitation from the city. Lenthall, the speaker, received the sword of state from the lord mayor, and delivered it back. Moreover, at the conclusion the chief magistrate presented £1,000 in gold to Lord Fairfax with a golden basin and ewer, £500 and a complete service of plate being conferred on Cromwell. The arrears of pay were also now prudently paid. Yet even after the suppression of the mutiny there was reason to dread further disturbances from the enthusiasm of the Levellers. Pamphlets from Lilburne's cell were eagerly read by the soldiers, whilst he himself was treated with singular lenity. In the month of June he petitioned for leave to visit his sick family, and was liberated from the Tower.

Cromwell was appointed by Parliament lord-lieutenant of Ireland, where all authority, civil and military, was vested in him for three years. After delaying his departure on account of various stipulations, a force of 12,000 veteran soldiers being assigned him, and the sum of £100,000 in ready money, the lord-lieutenant left London on July 15, in a carriage drawn by six horses, accompanied by a train so brilliant as to resemble a royal retinue. The streets of Westminster resounded with martial music, and the population were delighted with the gallant bearing and splendid uniforms of the eighty young men of quality of the life guard. Cromwell reached Bristol on the 14th, where he was delayed some weeks by his preparations. He sent several regiments over to Dublin to reinforce Lieutenant-General Jones, who was besieged in that city by the Marquis of Ormond. Whilst preparing to embark from Milford Haven, he heard the satisfactory news that Jones had

¹ Lingard, x. 281.

sallied forth from Dublin, and in an engagement called 'the Battle of Rathmines,' had totally routed Ormond's army, which would soon have received the addition of several thousand Scots.¹ The English Parliament expressed great satisfaction at this victory, and voted that lands to the yearly value of £500 should be conferred on General Jones. The Irish Royalists were much discouraged and began to distrust Ormond's ability, but Charles assured the marquis of his confidence, and sent him the Order of the Garter.

Inspired by this victory, Cromwell hastened to embark with one division, leaving his son-in-law, Ireton, to follow with the rest of the army. He was received by the people with great demonstrations of joy. A fortnight's rest was allowed the soldiers for recovery from the voyage. At that time only two towns in Ireland held out for the Commonwealth: Londonderry, which was besieged, and Dublin, which had only just been relieved. Cromwell's first undertaking was the siege of Drogheda, one of the most important towns in the province of Leinster, defended by Sir Arthur Ashton, an old officer of great bravery, at the head of 3,000 soldiers.

Having summoned the town in the name of the English Parliament to surrender, and received no satisfactory reply, Cromwell directed his batteries against the walls, and on the evening of the second day he succeeded in forcing the intrenchments, when a fearful massacre took place. Writing to William Lenthall, the Speaker, Cromwell acknowledged that in the heat of action he forbade his men to spare any bearing arms within the town, and that about 2,000 men were slain; also, that about 1,000 of the people, who had fled to the great church for safety, were put to death, and that the friars also perished.

The soldiers whose lives were spared were shipped off to Barbadoes. When thus directing the fierce fanaticism of his soldiers, Cromwell appears to have viewed it as a crime that the defenders of Drogheda had just previously celebrated mass. Yet, not altogether unaware of the horror which this account might excite, he urged that the severity would tend 'to prevent the effusion of blood for the future,' an expression which he repeated in his correspondence, 'otherwise such actions,' he acknowledges, 'cannot but work remorse and regret.'²

Wexford, having also resisted Cromwell's summons, met

¹ Carlyle, ii. 36; Lingard, x. 206. Rathmines is a village close by Dublin.

² Carlyle's 'Cromwell,' ii. 48-53. Cromwell called Drogheda in his letters by its ancient name—Tredah.

with a like terrible fate.¹ Severe to towns which resisted his arms, Cromwell maintained the strictest discipline, preventing any injury to the peaceable inhabitants, and requiring his troops to pay for all they consumed. Prince Rupert, on the contrary, at the head of his corsair fleet, was at this very time sailing round the British Isles, pillaging merchant vessels, and occasionally sending considerable sums to the relief of Charles.

Meantime the English government was disturbed by fresh seditious tracts published by Lilburne, and distributed among the soldiers. A meeting took place at Oxford, which was speedily suppressed. Lilburne was again imprisoned, and on October 25 he was tried at Guildhall on a charge of treason. When speaking in his own defence, the appeals which Lilburne made to Magna Charta and the liberties of Englishmen, produced so much effect upon his hearers, that in spite of government influence, after a trial lasting three days, he obtained a verdict of acquittal, on which a great shout of triumph was raised by the people. After his liberation, Lilburne was induced to subscribe 'the Engagement,' a promise of fidelity to the Commonwealth as then existing, which had been at first required from only those holding office, but afterwards from all Englishmen. This Lilburne explained in a sense conformable to his own principles, and the Parliament voted him a considerable sum of money in recompense for his sufferings under the monarchy.² The Levellers had boldly declared their discontent, but the Royalists were meantime secretly at work, holding meetings in different parts of England, sometimes under the pretence of religious worship, sometimes as if for carrying on country amusements. Strong measures were taken by the council to guard against sedition, and a High Court of Justice was permanently established to inquire into offences against the state.

While Cromwell was pursuing his victorious course in Ireland, Charles Stuart arrived at Jersey, the only part of his ancestral dominions which continued to acknowledge the monarchy. Hesitating whether, after the battle of Rathmines, he could safely trust himself in Ireland, he received in October, 1649, addresses from the Scottish Parliament and Kirk, couched in terms of rebuke and warning which were revolting to his feelings. Perplexed by different advisers, Charles appointed

¹ The reputed massacre of two hundred women in the market-place is now altogether discredited.—Carlyle's 'Cromwell,' ii. 102.

² Lingard, x. 347.

a convention to meet at Breda, a town under the jurisdiction of the Prince of Orange, where in March he received the Earls of Cassilis and Lothian, with other deputies from Scotland. To consent to their demands appeared to him apostacy from the principles which his father held most dear. The commissioners rebuked him for his connexion with the Marquis of Montrose, whom they styled 'that fugacious man and excommunicate rebel, James Graham,' but before leaving France, he had given to Montrose a commission to raise the royal standard in Scotland, and was still hoping, by means of that loyal adherent, to be placed on the throne without conditions. The Prince of Orange, however, strongly advised him to acquiesce in the terms offered by the Scots; it was suggested by some that, when on the throne, he might overcome the obstinacy of the Scottish Parliament, and his mother urged him not to abandon the only resource left to the royal cause.

In Ireland, Cromwell, at the head of 20,000 men, was marching from victory to victory, and the Royalists, destitute of money and arms, were driven to Connaught as their last refuge. At Kilkenny, towards the end of March, the determined bravery of the inhabitants and some losses on his own side, induced him to grant more moderate terms than heretofore. A ransom of £2,000 was accepted for the city, and the garrison was allowed to march out with the honours of war. Wherever Cromwell appeared he held out the promise of life and liberty of conscience: the rejection of his offer being too often punished by the blood of the principal defenders.¹ The massacre of 1641, when the Irish turned against the Ulster settlers and slaughtered many thousand Scots and English, excited the Protestants to retaliate in 1649.² The severity exercised by Cromwell during his nine months' rule in Ireland, has left a lasting remembrance, but if his severity was great, his justice was even. The estates of those who were proved to have participated in the Irish rebellion were declared forfeit; justice and mercy were promised to all others who engaged to live quietly in future, and to those private soldiers who would lay down their arms. All persons guiltless of rebellion were promised protection and equal justice with the English, and in

¹ Lingard, x. 287, note. Lingard, though commonly unfavourable to Cromwell, allows that he 'did not introduce the practice of massacre: he followed his predecessors, whose avowed object was to exterminate the natives.'—This was never Cromwell's design.

² Respecting this massacre in 1641, notice of which is so nearly omitted by Lingard, see a long note in Hallam, ii. 551.

case of ill-usage from the soldiery, the lord-lieutenant promised that any proved offence should be severely punished.¹

When writing to the Speaker after the capture of Kilkenny, Cromwell insisted, as usual, on his pressing want of money and recruits, and signified his readiness to return to England, although in a tone of ready submission to the commands of those in authority.² At the end of April, a frigate was sent to Ireland from Milford Haven to attend his Excellency's pleasure. Cromwell first proceeded to storm Clonmel, where he met with a stouter resistance than he had yet experienced. By his account, 'there had been never seen so hot a storm of so long continuance, and so gallantly defended, either in England or Ireland.' This garrison obtained favourable terms. Cromwell granted licences to numerous Irish officers after their surrender, to embody regiments and lead them into any country not at war with England. Some five and forty thousand Irishmen, 'of whom Ireland was well rid,' thus betook themselves to the service of France and Spain.³ Leaving Ireton to complete the subjugation of Ireland, Cromwell set sail on May 30 for Bristol, and was received both in that city and in London with the warmest acclamations. St. James's Palace was assigned as his residence, and a large grant of lands was voted as a recompense for his services: but events of importance in Scotland demanded immediate attention.

Secure of the young king's confidence, Montrose had already, in the autumn of 1649, visited the northern courts of Europe, and had obtained permission from several sovereigns to levy men, besides receiving presents of money or military stores. He despatched 1,200 men from Gottenburg to the Orkneys in October, under Lord Kinnoul; but the weather was tempestuous, and less than two hundred of the number escaped shipwreck, and assembled at Kirkwall.

Montrose, however, followed in January with 500 men, chiefly foreigners, and by adding these and others newly levied to the survivors of the first expedition, he mustered a force exceeding 1,000 men. He exhibited a banner on which was a representation of the late king when decapitated, with the words, 'Judge and avenge my cause, O Lord;' and circulated a declaration exhorting all true Scotsmen to aid the cause of their young king. But an invasion of Scotland by Montrose awakened bitter animosity. Having once fought alongside the Covenanters, he had now become their bitterest enemy, and his

¹ See Cromwell's declaration at Youghal, Jan. 1650, Carlyle, ii. 116-118.

² *Ib.* 136-142.

³ *Ib.* 148.

devastating inroad in the winter and spring of 1645, when half the clan Campbell were slain and the Marquis of Argyle had to fly for his life, had left behind ineffaceable memories.

The time of retaliation was come. His declaration was solemnly burnt by the hangman in Edinburgh; the pulpits denounced him in the strongest terms as a rebel and apostate, and in April, Colonel Strachan surprised him on the borders of Ross-shire. After the defeat of his forces, Montrose sought the protection of a laird who had formerly served under him, but was delivered up to his exulting adversaries.

The triumphant party omitted no insult which might aggravate his lot. On May 18, the marquis was brought to Edinburgh, seated in a cart, manacled and bareheaded. Two days afterwards, he was summoned before the Parliament, and sentenced to be hanged on a gibbet thirty feet high, his arms and legs to be afterwards dissevered and distributed for exhibition at other towns. Both during his condemnation and on the scaffold, Montrose showed the same lofty bearing. He defended the uprightness of his intentions, and praised the character of the young king. When the executioner hung his late declaration round his neck, he smiled and called it even a more honourable decoration than the Order of the Garter which he had lately received from the king. He died in his 38th year. It is said that the execution was hastened that Charles might not have time to intercede in his favour; but at this time Charles was far too anxious for himself to risk the avowal of sympathy for his unfortunate adherent. Acting, as Lingard observes, according to 'the unworthy example set by his father in respect of the commission given to Glamorgan,' Charles, immediately after hearing of the defeat of Montrose, wrote to the Scottish Parliament protesting, in the strongest terms, that he had forbidden the marquis to invade Scotland. Charles even sent assurances to the Marquis of Argyle that he could feel no regret for the defeat of a man who had presumed to draw the sword 'contrary to the royal command.'¹ It is known that on March 15, the very day on which the conferences began at Breda, Charles despatched an order to Montrose to proceed according to his instructions.

When the letters from the king reached Scotland, the limbs of this unfortunate victim of mistaken loyalty were already suspended on the city gates; but the falsehood so shamelessly proclaimed yet remains an everlasting stigma upon his royal master. Charles had now no resource but to submit to condi-

¹ Lingard, x. 307.

tions which he heartily disapproved, and which he was eager to break at the first opportunity. He signed a treaty with the Scots, guaranteeing their solemn League and Covenant; disavowed the peace which had been concluded with the Irish Catholics, and declared that he would never allow the free exercise of the Roman Catholic mode of worship in any part of his dominions, but would govern in all respects according to the advice of the Parliament and Church of Scotland.

This negotiation having prepared the way for his reception, Charles arrived in Scotland on June 23, after a perilous voyage of three weeks in stormy weather, escaping the cruisers sent for his capture by the English Parliament. He was received with due honour, a court with the requisite officers was assigned him, and the sum of £9,000 English voted to defray the monthly expenses of his household; but it was with difficulty, after repeated applications, and after they had subscribed the Covenant, that the Duke of Buckingham, Lord Wilmot, and a few English servants, obtained permission to remain at the Scottish court.¹

War between England and Scotland was now inevitable, if the Commonwealth were to be maintained. The Scots had resisted all efforts of persuasion, and the force of arms alone could bring them to abandon their new king. Lord Fairfax was appointed commander-in-chief of the army to be employed in Scotland, with Cromwell for his lieutenant-general; but Fairfax refused to command an expedition 'to oppose and violate the solemn League and Covenant' which he had sworn to observe. The argument that by the invasion of England under the Duke of Hamilton the Scots had themselves broken the League, failed to satisfy Fairfax; he resigned the commissions which he had received from Parliament, and retired to his country seat in Yorkshire, never again to draw his sword in support of the Commonwealth. Parliament consequently conferred the chief command on Oliver Cromwell, who crossed the Tweed on July 16 at the head of sixteen thousand men, mostly veteran soldiers. The chief command of the Scottish army was given to David Lesley, a relative of the aged Earl of Leven. Orders were promptly issued that the country between Berwick and Edinburgh should be laid waste and deserted by the inhabitants. Gross exaggerations had been circulated concerning the cruelty lately exercised in Ireland, and the few old women and children whom the English met on their march begged for mercy on their knees.

¹ Lingard, x. 308.

But the conduct of the English forces soon dispelled the people's apprehensions, and Cromwell conducted his army along the coast, so that they were supplied with provisions by the fleet.

The Scottish Parliament had the greatest reason to distrust Charles's sincerity; their glaring error was the belief that it was possible to bind his conscience by any form of declaration. Before recourse was had to arms on his behalf, he was required to sign a protest in expiation of past acts, lamenting in penitent language his father's opposition to the Covenant, declaring that he had subscribed it with sincerity, and would have no friendship with any who refused their adherence; he was moreover obliged to denounce the treaty 'with the bloody rebels in Ireland,' to declare his detestation of Popery and Prelacy, and his intention of reforming the Church of England. When this declaration was laid before Charles for signature, he refused to subscribe a paper so humiliating to his pride—so abhorrent to his every feeling. But the determined zeal of the committees of the Kirk and kingdom overcame his opposition, and after three days he affixed his name, 'with tears,' it is said, to the protest against which his heart rebelled.¹ Whatever the Scots may have hoped to gain by exacting a declaration so plainly insincere, they could scarcely suppose, on reflection, that his conduct through life would adjust itself to that act of perjury by which he intended to win the crown. The Prince's unwilling acquiescence was received, however, in Scotland with general joy.

Meanwhile, in the course of July, Cromwell had advanced to the outskirts of Edinburgh, where he found the Scottish army too strongly posted for him to risk an attack. Finding it impossible to bring Lesley off his defensive position, he was compelled to retire upon Dunbar for supplies. But no sooner had he retired than he was pursued by the Scottish general, who, placing the chief of his army upon Doon Hill facing Dunbar, detached a force to occupy the pass on the road to Berwick, and thus cut off from the English all possibility of retreat. Cromwell's army stood on the rocky peninsula close to Dunbar, whilst the Scottish troops, numbering 23,000 (double the number of the English) occupied the heights above them. In the full knowledge of his difficult position, with his soldiers falling ill 'beyond imagination,' Cromwell addressed a letter to Sir Arthur Haselrig, the governor of Newcastle, wishing that '*friends* should know their danger, but not the public.' To

¹ Lingard. x. 314.

send the letter was difficult; in fact it was not sent until accompanied by tidings of a complete victory on the morrow.¹

Immediately after writing that letter, Cromwell, anxiously surveying the Scottish camp through his glass, perceived with satisfaction that General Lesley was descending from his high position, on which discovery he determined to begin battle next morning before dawn. The night was stormy, but the English troops prepared for the attack, and at four in the morning of September 3 they assaulted the right wing of the Scots.

In a few hours the Scottish army was scattered; 10,000 were prisoners of the English, and their general had fled to Edinburgh. Cromwell gave notice to the inhabitants that they might safely go to the fields to rescue any wounded soldiers.² He computed the number of the slain at about 3,000. 'Surely,' he says, writing to Haselrig, 'the Kirk has done their do.' 'I believe,' he adds, 'the king will set up upon his own score now, wherein he will find many friends;' a prophecy which proved correct.

'Some of the honestest in the Scottish army,' says Cromwell, writing to the Lord President of the English Council, 'did profess before the fight that they did not believe their king in his declaration,' and yet they venture their lives for him upon this account, and publish it to the world 'as the act of a person converted.'

Cromwell declared his reluctance to make war upon the Scots, a people whom he in many respects esteemed. Scarcity of provisions obliged him to dismiss some thousands of prisoners, 'almost starved, sick and wounded;' the rest were sent southward. After the victory at Dunbar he took possession of Edinburgh, although the castle still held out against him. Finding that the resistance to his arms had been mainly owing to the clergy, some of whom actually fought at Dunbar, Cromwell entered into correspondence with the ministers in the castle, expostulating on their narrowness towards those whom they called 'sectaries,' and on their reliance on a king concerning whose so-called 'repentance' they had published so false a paper, 'knowing with what importunities and threats' he had been brought to sign it, and how to that very day he was against it.³ The lord-general offered to allow the clergy who remained in the castle permis-

¹ Carlyle, ii. 195.

² Ib. ii. 187.

³ Ib. ii. 215. When appealing against the excessive authority claimed by the Scottish Church, Cromwell said, 'We' (in England) 'look at ministers as helpers of, not lords over, God's people.'—Ib. 209.

sion to preach in the city churches, if they so wished, but they declined his offer, setting forth at the same time their grievances. An English clergyman consequently officiated in the High Church at Edinburgh, and some of the officers also preached in other churches.

Cromwell had rightly guessed that the king would now be eager, if possible, to 'set up upon his own score,' namely to act without the guidance of the Covenanting clergy. Charles had with difficulty suppressed his satisfaction at the defeat of the Scottish army at Dunbar, and having entered into a negotiation with the Marquis of Huntley, General Middleton, and other Royalists who were raising forces in the Highlands, he ventured, under the pretence of hawking, to escape from the Committee of Estates, and rode off from Perth to the Grampian Hills, forty-two miles, where he passed the night in a wretched hut. But information of his flight having been given to the Marquis of Argyle, who was at the head of the official party, Charles was promptly overtaken by Colonel Montgomery, who persuaded him to return to Perth forthwith. The committee prudently admitted the king's apology, who gave out that he had acted on a sudden fear of being delivered up to Cromwell, and they made use of his authority to persuade the Royalists in the Highlands to disband their followers. This sudden freak has been called in history 'The Start.'¹

At length, on December 24, after much negotiation, Cromwell obtained peaceable possession of Edinburgh Castle, all persons within the castle remaining without molestation.

The Scottish Parliament now hoped to strengthen their position by crowning their king, and on January 1, 1651, Charles rode in procession to the church of Scone, where his ancestors had been invariably crowned, and solemnly swore to observe the two Covenants, to establish the Presbyterian forms in Scotland, and, if possible, throughout his dominions, 'to abolish and withstand all false religions, and to root out all heretics.' The Marquis of Argyle then placed the crown upon his head and seated him on the throne, and both the nobility and people swore allegiance to him, 'according to the Covenant.'

The Scottish minister, Douglas, addressed the king in a tone of grave admonition, assuring him that the misfortunes which befel his father were caused by apostacy, and that by strict adherence to the Covenant only could the son silence those who doubted his sincerity. The coronation increased the

¹ Lingard, x. 317; Carlyle, ii. 221.

king's influence in Scotland; in the following April he took the command of the army, which was raised to 20,000 men.¹

The compassion naturally felt for the young king while subject to the bigotry of the Covenanters is abated when we find that at the very time when, to satisfy his Scottish subjects, he abjured Popery in the strongest terms, he wrote to the Pope, whom he was endeavouring to interest in his behalf, as his most powerful intercessor with the Catholic powers of Europe. With this object he even promised to grant entire toleration to the Catholics, and sent agents to Rome and to Spain. That sovereign, however, 'well aware of the hereditary duplicity of the Stuarts, received his overtures with haughty contempt.'² In these negotiations, says Hallam, Charles solicited such aid from foreign powers as would have made him at once the tyrant of England and the vassal of Spain.

The English Parliament testified their satisfaction at the victory of Dunbar by sending an artist to Edinburgh to take Cromwell's likeness for a commemorative medal.³ During this spring (1651) Cromwell became seriously ill from fever and ague, lasting at intervals from February till June. The Parliament became alarmed, requested him to return to the milder air of England, and at the latter end of May despatched two London doctors to his aid, to whom Lord Fairfax kindly lent the accommodation of his own coach.⁴

There was, indeed, much need of Cromwell, for the Royalist party was rallying for another contest. At the beginning of May a small ship was driven by bad weather into Ayr Harbour, which, on being searched by Cromwell's officers, revealed a correspondence between the London Presbyterians, their minister, Christopher Love, and other Royalists, with the Earl of Derby, who was then in the Isle of Man. Love was tried in consequence and convicted of being the centre of a Royalist conspiracy; after which he was executed at Tower Hill.⁵

The arms of Cromwell and Lambert were successful in Scotland, but the country to the south remained open, and in August Charles was able to traverse the Lowlands and the northern counties of England without meeting a single foe.

¹ Lingard, x. 321–323.

² Hallam, i. 665–666, and note.

³ Carlyle, ii. 254. The medal was made by Symonds, who also made the new 'Great Seals,' and was still employed in that way after the Restoration. It still exists, and is a good likeness.

⁴ Cromwell, in a letter of June 3, acknowledges this 'very high and undeserved favour.'—Carlyle, p. 215.

⁵ Lingard, x. 350.

His attempt was full of peril, for it appeared that in case of defeat his father's fate awaited him, but he was assured of powerful aid in England. The Marquis of Argyle, the principal personage at Charles's recent coronation, obtained permission to return home; but an army of 14,000 men invaded England, with the king at its head. Charles pushed rapidly forward to Worcester, where he was solemnly proclaimed king on August 22.

The news of his advance was heard at Westminster with dismay; but Cromwell's despatches roused the Parliament to action, and the proclamation which Charles issued offering pardon to all except Cromwell, Bradshaw, and Coke, was burnt in London by the common hangman.¹ The newly proclaimed king was in his turn declared guilty of high treason. Orders were given for a strict watch to be set over persons known as Royalists, and masters of families in the disturbed districts were desired to hold their children and servants in safe keeping.

Charles sent the Order of the Garter to the brave Earl of Derby, in expectation of his co-operation. Although he had no confidence in the success of the undertaking, and no sympathy with the Scots, Derby left his Isle of Man and landed in Lancashire, 'to join in as unpromising an enterprise as ever threw away good lives.'² After having raised some forces in Lancashire, Derby encountered Colonel Lilburne at Wigan, and joined the king at Worcester with a disabled regiment. Cromwell meantime was steadily advancing by York, Nottingham, and Stratford-on-Avon, joined by the militia of various counties, and appeared before Worcester with upwards of 30,000 men. The disastrous repulse sustained by the Duke of Hamilton three years previously had deterred many of the Scots; and few of the discontented Royalists in England now ventured to join the Presbyterian army. The battle of Worcester, fought on the evening of September 3, one twelvemonth after Cromwell's victory at Dunbar, 'could have but one issue—defeat for the Scots and their cause.'³ King Charles and his counsellors anxiously watched the first progress of the enemy, while Colonel Fleetwood built bridges of boats, and brought over his men. Surrounded by an overpowering force, and cut off from all help, the small Scottish army continued to fight with great bravery for four or five hours, but was at last utterly broken up. Charles is said to have fought at the head of the Highlanders

¹ Bradshaw was exempted from pardon as having been the presiding judge at the trial of Charles I., and Coke as the solicitor-general employed against the king.

² H. Coleridge's 'Memoir of the Earl of Derby.'

³ Carlyle, ii. 287-290.

with spirit worthy of a prince who staked his life to gain a crown.¹

Vainly endeavouring to rally the fugitive Royalists in the streets, he exclaimed in despair that he would rather die than survive his defeat. The feeling was soon succeeded, however, by anxiety for his own preservation. It was the brave Earl of Derby who, himself wounded, led the king to St. Martin's Gate, and counselled him where to seek shelter and protection. Derby then rode towards 'his own country,' but was taken prisoner and conducted to Chester.² In vain he pleaded on his trial that quarter had been offered him by his captor. He petitioned the Lord-General and Parliament for mercy, offering to surrender the Isle of Man, but his doom was irrevocable, and he was executed at Bolton, in Lancashire, on October 15.

The battle was disastrous to the nobility. The Duke of Hamilton, brother of the late unfortunate duke, died of his wounds; several noblemen were made prisoners, and others found safety in concealment. The Scots who attempted to escape are said to have been universally betrayed by their accent.³ Three thousand Royalists fell upon the field, and the prisoners even outnumbered the slain.

A thousand pounds was offered for the apprehension of Charles, but in vain; the young king was carefully concealed and protected by devoted adherents. Disguised by a complete change of dress, having stained his face and cropped his hair, Charles trusted himself to some labouring men named Penderell, Roman Catholics, who had before assisted in screening priests and Cavaliers from pursuit.⁴ It was on September 6 that he concealed himself amongst the branches of a spreading oak, and saw his pursuers pass by. This celebrated oak, which grew near the common path in a field close to Boscobel, was afterwards felled and sawn up for memorials to gratify Royalist devotion. After assuming various disguises, walking long distances, and meeting with adventures in which Charles showed both courage and presence of mind, he personated a domestic servant, and having made a three days' journey on horseback with his supposed mistress on a pillion behind him, arrived on September 14 at Abbotsleigh, near Bristol. There, finding

¹ Lingard, x. 329.

² Hartley Coleridge's 'Memoir.'

³ Lingard, p. 331.

⁴ The surviving Penderells, at first a family of six brothers, three of whom fought on the side of Charles I., were rewarded by gifts at the Restoration. Even so late as the year 1838, one of their descendants received a yearly pension of £40 on account of the services conferred by her ancestors.—Lingard, p. 333, note.

himself recognised by a butler who had formerly been a servant in the royal palace at Richmond, Charles prudently confided in the man, and requested his help in effecting his escape. He was not disappointed. After trying to embark at various ports in vain, he went on board ship at last at Brighton, and landed at Fécamp on October 17. He is said to have been known by forty-five persons, of different ranks in society, whose integrity was proof against temptation.

Whilst Charles was threading his way amidst so many dangers, Cromwell advanced to London in triumph. Four commissioners, bearing the congratulations of Parliament, went beyond Aylesbury to meet him, to each of whom he presented a horse and two of the prisoners, who would, it was expected, pay a large ransom.

At his entry into London, Cromwell was met by the Speaker, with a large number of members and principal citizens, who accompanied him to a banquet at Whitehall. Hampton Court Palace was assigned him as a residence, with an income of £4,000 a year.

Cromwell's air while thus receiving the homage of the people was dignified and lofty; indeed, a bystander, who had long known him, observed, 'This man will be King of England yet.'

The battle of Worcester was the last of Cromwell's victories. He had left General Monk to complete the subjugation of Scotland. After obtaining possession of Stirling, where were preserved the royal robes and national records of Scotland, Monk marched forward to Dundee, which, as it resisted, met with the usual fate of a city taken by storm. Before the end of the year the whole of Scotland had submitted to the rule of the English Parliament.¹

It had been Cromwell's practice in Ireland to send numbers of prisoners of war to the plantations in America. It appears that some care was taken of those sent to Boston, in New England, after the battle of Dunbar. They were not condemned to perpetual servitude, but allowed to devote a portion of their labour to their own benefit; they had thus the prospect of ultimate redemption.² But on September 13, the day after Cromwell's triumphant return, a sad transaction took place at Tothill Fields, when fifteen hundred of the common prisoners of war passed through the streets to be sold to merchants for transport to the Gold Coast of Africa.

¹ Lingard, x. 373.

² See a letter from Rev. J. Cotton, of Boston, July, 1651, quoted by Carlyle, ii. 309.

The honour of the Chancellorship of the University of Oxford was at this time conferred upon Cromwell, and Parliament decreed an annual commemoration of the victory of September 3 throughout the three kingdoms 'for all time to come.'¹

A great ferment was occasioned in Ireland, at the time of the battle of Worcester, when copies of the Declaration, signed by Charles in Scotland, began to appear. The king had pronounced the Irish 'bloody rebels,' had disowned the late treaty, and had declared his wish to exterminate their religion. Ormond, who had just received the title of duke, at first attempted to decry the paper as a forgery, inasmuch as it contradicted Charles's assurances from Breda. He had yet to learn that a Stuart king could sign any declaration when tempted by interest, and yet reserve the privilege of punishing his instruments afterwards. Unable to soothe the angry feelings with which the king's conduct was viewed in Ireland, particularly by the prelates, Ormond relinquished his post, and withdrew to the continent, leaving the Marquis of Clanricarde, a Roman Catholic, as his deputy.

The Irish Royalists, perplexed by dread of Cromwell's arms and by their aversion to the Scottish Covenanters, had been, during the summer of 1650, persuaded by the queen-mother and the Duke of York to enter on a treaty with the Duke of Lorraine, a prince 'who was accustomed to sell at a high price the services of his army.'² The Irish were assured that this duke was the only European prince who could give them such assistance as would enable them to escape subjugation by the Parliament. The negotiation, begun by Ormond, was continued by Clanricarde, who appears to have finally disapproved of the treaty arranged at Brussels in July, 1651. By this document the Duke of Lorraine had promised efficient aid in arms on condition that the title of Protector-Royal of Ireland, coupled with the chief civil authority and command of the forces, should be conferred on him and his heirs; subject, however, to the proviso that in case Charles should acquire the throne he would restore to him the ascendancy on payment of his expenses. The execution of this disgraceful treaty was happily prevented by the duke's arrest, he being taken prisoner by the Spaniards and carried to Toledo in March, 1652.

Meantime, the English troops, commanded by General Ireton, and afterwards by Colonel Fleetwood, continued to prevail; and although the king, in violation of his royal word,

¹ Forster's 'British Statesmen,' vii. 9.

² Lingard, x. 359.

exhorted the Irish to persevere in his cause, it became difficult to persuade men still to hazard life and fortune without the remotest prospect of success. Early in 1652 resistance ceased both in Ireland and Scotland, and the authority of the English Commonwealth prevailed also in Jersey, Guernsey, Scilly, and Man, where many Royalists had taken refuge. New England, Virginia, Barbadoes, and all English territories abroad, also accepted the Republican rule. Prince Rupert had been compelled to desist from piracy in this part of the globe, and the English flag was respected by all powers except that of the United Provinces. The Prince of Orange, chief of that nominal Republic, having married a daughter of Charles I., naturally favoured the Stuarts, and the only protest sent by a foreign court against the anticipated execution of Charles arrived from Holland. Its neglect in England aroused abiding resentment.

The Prince of Orange died in November, 1650, a few days before the birth of that son who, as William III. of England, was in later years the great enemy of the Stuart dynasty. Attempts were made on both sides to negotiate a peace, but the Dutch, who had been the general carriers of Europe, felt aggrieved at the Navigation Act passed by the English Parliament in 1651. This enacted that all produce imported into England from any part of the world should be brought either in English vessels or in those of the country whence the cargo was obtained. The high-handed practice of stopping and searching the vessels of other nations adopted by the English captains now brought about a war between England and Holland. In November, 1652, the Dutch admiral, Van Tromp, victorious over the smaller English force commanded by Blake, fixed a broom to his mast-head. The English were to be swept from the seas. The English Parliament took immediate measures to wipe off this disgrace. Two regiments of infantry embarked as marines, the wages of the seamen were raised, and in the February following a victory off Weymouth, although dearly bought, restored the ascendancy of the British navy.

But the war so urgently demanded money as to incite Parliament to further exactions from the Royalists, who, in the current slang of this time, were called 'Delinquents.' In their eagerness to supply the exhausted treasury there was danger lest the cathedrals should fall a sacrifice; the lead was actually stripped from the roofs of churches.¹ The sale of the parks

¹ Carlyle, ii. 317.

and palaces of Windsor and Hampton Court, and of other valuable property, had been already voted, when Parliament was suddenly arrested in its course at the command of its victorious general. The present Parliament, the tolerated residue of that Long Parliament which conducted the civil war, continued to govern, but without legal right. Aware how needful was a change, it yet had not ventured to dissolve while the Commonwealth was struggling with rival factions. There were brave and able men in that assembly — Sir Harry Vane, Algernon Sidney, Colonel Hutchinson, and others—but in some acts the House had shown discreditable partiality; moreover, so long as it continued in power, the hopes of those Republicans were disappointed who looked to a more equal representation of the people, an extensive reform in the law and the Church, and a full toleration of religious worship, as the rewards of their late arduous struggle for liberty.¹ Some approach towards establishing a future Parliament of 400 members had, however, been made; and in November, 1651, a majority voted that they would dissolve after three more years, namely in November, 1654. The Republicans murmured at this long delay, and the more discontented politicians conferred with Cromwell. At a conference held about this time at the Speaker's house in Chancery Lane, Cromwell desired the advice of some leading 'grandees' of the Parliament and army how best the country could be governed, whether by a republican or a limited monarchical rule; and, if in any way monarchical, in whom should the authority be vested? The general sense of the meeting appears to have been expressed by Chief Justice St. John in favour of 'something of monarchical power,' without which it would be difficult to maintain the established laws and the liberties of the people. So clearly perceived was the advantage of hereditary claims, that on this occasion, not two years after the execution of Charles, it appears to have been suggested that it would be 'most just to place this power in one of the sons of the late king.'² The young Duke of Gloucester, third son of Charles I., had remained in England under restraint. But Cromwell, who appears to have meditated his own elevation to the royal office, soon afterwards obtained the young prince's liberation, and he was sent to the care of his

¹ Hallam, i. 657; Lingard, x. 345.

² This conference is said to have taken place about the end of 1651, and the subject was renewed between Cromwell and Whitelock alone twelve months afterwards, when the latter tried to dissuade Cromwell from aspiring to be king, by urging that the government 'would then become a private controversy between his family and that of the Stuarts.'—Hallam, i. 655–656.

sister, the Princess of Orange, with £500 to defray his expenses. The national impatience at the delay of the dissolution was shown by numerous violent pamphlets, and by the sermons of preachers in Cromwell's confidence, who urged the employment of force to effect a change. Vane is said to have been urging the House to admit a large addition of representatives at the very time when Cromwell once for all forcibly closed the sitting. On April 20 the Lord-General went to the House accompanied by a few officers, directing a detachment of soldiers to follow. He entered the House alone, in his usual plain dress, and, after listening for a time to the debate, rose to speak. He soon launched into invective against some of the principal members present, and accused the assembly of injustice, of being subservient to the lawyers, and of neglecting the soldiers who had bled for them in the field. He was interrupted by Sir Peter Wentworth, who declared such language to be unparliamentary, and the more offensive because addressed to them by their own servant, whom they had raised to his present position. But that servant had now become their master. Putting on his hat, as if to show that he no longer regarded the House with the semblance of respect, Cromwell exclaimed, 'Come, come, I will put an end to your prating.' In apparent agitation he paced the floor for a few seconds, then cried, stamping with his feet, 'You are no Parliament! I say you are no Parliament! Let them come in!' The door opened, and Colonel Wortley entered, followed by more than twenty soldiers armed with muskets.¹ Sir Harry Vane, who had been on intimate terms with Cromwell, is said to have exclaimed that such conduct was 'contrary to common honesty,' to which Cromwell replied by angrily declaring that Vane was himself 'a juggler,' and had not 'common honesty,' and by ordering the soldiers to clear the House. Lenthall, the Speaker, refused to quit his place, on which Colonel Harrison, taking him by the hand, led him from the chair.

Lifting up the mace, which lay on the table before the Speaker's seat, Cromwell is said to have exclaimed, 'What shall we do with this bauble? Take it away!' and it was carried away. Having ordered the door to be locked, after the members (whom Cromwell counted as fifty-three, others as eighty or one hundred) had all withdrawn, he then returned to Whitehall, attended by his military escort.

The Council assembled that afternoon as usual. Bradshaw

¹ This name, printed Worsley in Lingard's history, was probably Wortley. See 'Leicester Square,' by Thomas Taylor, 1874, p. 85.

had just taken the chair, when Cromwell entered and informed those present that they were welcome to sit there as private persons, but not as the Council of State, the Council having ceased to exist at the dissolution of the Parliament.

The President, who had dared to pass sentence of death on the king, had courage to reply to Cromwell, 'Sir, we have heard what you did this morning at the House, and before many hours all England will know it. But, Sir, you are mistaken to think that the Parliament is dissolved. No power under heaven can dissolve them but themselves. Of that take notice.' The Council then retired.¹ But the country did not sympathise with Bradshaw's appeal.

The Parliament, which had existed more than twelve years, although nominally, during the last four years, the supreme power, had been guaranteed solely by military force.² The power of the Commonwealth had been secured not by Parliamentary debatings, but in the battle-field under Oliver Cromwell; and although great deeds had been done under the auspices of this assembly, much discontent was caused by the means taken to replenish the exhausted revenue. Their penalties had fallen severely on the Royalists. They had, however, effected an improvement by enacting that the laws should be written in English, and had rescinded the fines exacted for non-attendance at church, proclaiming the freedom of mankind to worship God according to their consciences; nevertheless toleration was still refused to the Churches of England and Rome. Among those who suffered from the forfeiture of a large part of their income or earnings, in consequence of their refusal to take the oath of abjuration, were many in humble life, husbandmen, servants, and mechanics. A petition for indulgence from some of these was supported by Sir Harry Vane, in June, 1652, but rejected by Parliament.³ So numerous, therefore, were the parties which the Parliament had by its late conduct disappointed or offended, that its fall caused no regret, except in those who chiefly dreaded the alternative of military usurpation or anarchy.⁴ Excepting the 'Lord-General, Commander-in-Chief of all the Forces,' there was for the moment no presiding authority in England; but the judges and magistrates remained in office, and there was no interruption of the usual order and obedience to law. Some aldermen of London ventured to petition the Lord-General that Parliament might be allowed to meet once more, in order to vote regularly their own dis-

¹ Lingard, x. 395.

² Lingard, x. 399.

³ Hallam, i. 654; Carlyle, ii. 305.

⁴ Hallam, i. 660.

solution; but a counter-petition from the city assured Cromwell of popular support, and he received a great number of congratulatory addresses, one of which, from the army in Scotland, testified the general confidence. Admiral Blake, a sincere Republican, on hearing of the fall of the Parliament, assembled his captains and advised them to attend simply to their duties in defence of their country.

A new Council of State was appointed, of which Cromwell was president. Early in June writs were issued summoning a new Parliament to provide 'for the peace, safety, and good government of the Commonwealth.' The ministers of the Congregational churches throughout England were desired to send lists of men whom they could recommend as most faithful and conscientious, from which the Council selected a hundred and thirty-nine English representatives, six for Ireland, six for Wales, and five for Scotland; every name being submitted to Cromwell's consideration.

The gentlemen so chosen were desired to meet at the Council-chamber at Whitehall on July 4, when each of them was named as member for, a distinct constituency, and enjoined to undertake the duty accordingly. A strange mode, as it now appears to us, of reforming Parliament! Whitelock says: 'Many of this assembly being persons of fortune and knowledge, it was much wondered at by some that they would, from such hands, take upon themselves the supreme authority of this nation, considering how little right Cromwell and his officers had to give it, or these gentlemen to take it.' This convention, which has been commonly called 'The Little Parliament,' was unjustly described as consisting of low and ignorant persons, and the strange name of one of its members, Praise-God Barbone, a respectable leather-seller in London, gave occasion for ridicule. The list of members, still preserved, contains many honourable names. It was in fact 'a real assembly of the notables in Puritan England.' On the appointed day Cromwell addressed these members, to the number of about a hundred and twenty, in the Council-chamber; surrounded as usual by his principal officers, he entered on a survey of public affairs from the time of the civil war, endeavouring to justify the expulsion of the last Parliament, which he owned to have been 'an act of violence,' and

¹ 'Mr. Praise-God Barbone,' says Carlyle, 'was a man of piety, understanding, and weight.' His name, at that time of uncertain spelling, appears to have been sometimes written *Barebones*, which excited the ridicule of Royalists. See also Hallam, i. 661, note, refuting Hume's aspersions.

which he declared to have been to him 'worse than any battle in which he had been engaged.' He said that he had been 'most desirous that if possible these men might quit their places with honour.' But the late Parliament had disregarded the petitions sent by the army, and were preparing to let the chief power come into the hands of the Presbyterians, that party which had 'deserted the good cause.'

Cromwell endeavoured to dispel all apprehensions that he aimed at grasping the chief power in the State, or wished to keep it in military hands, which he 'would not for a day.' He had striven to trust the government to 'proper persons called from the several parts of the nation.' After exhorting the members to be guided by morality and religion, he urged on them, with an extension of liberality most unusual among religious enthusiasts, that justice ought to be done equally to unbelievers, and that 'the most mistaken Christian should be protected if desiring to live peaceably.' Inculcating perfect charity towards men 'of different judgments,' Cromwell allowed that 'an interest of love' ought to be extended to the Presbyterians. He had admitted eight or nine members of the late Parliament to the Council of State, and the spontaneous addresses which he received from all divisions of the army and navy had justified his conduct beyond his expectation. Speaking thus, with many quotations from Scripture, the Lord-General left to the consideration of the new Parliament an 'Instrument of Government' framed by the advice of the Council of Officers, which arranged that their assembly would be succeeded on September 3 of the following year by a really representative Parliament.¹ September 3, the day on which Cromwell gained the victories of Dunbar and Worcester, was always kept by him as a day of thanksgiving.

John Lilburne, who had been banished in 1649 by order of Parliament, petitioned Cromwell in 1653 for leave to return. His petition was not answered; he returned, and was immediately sent to Newgate. Numerous petitions in his favour were presented to Parliament, but the Council furnished the House with proof that he had been intriguing whilst on the continent with the English Royalists. His trial took place in August, and lasted three days. Papers were circulated in London declaring that 20,000 men were willing to risk their lives for him, upon which Cromwell posted two companies of soldiers near the court, and much increased the force in the city. Nevertheless,

¹ Carlyle's 'Cromwell,' ii. 336-360. Cromwell's speeches were always extempore.

at a late hour on August 20, Lilburne was acquitted, and the triumphant shouts of the people reached Whitehall. Cromwell was unwilling to abide by the verdict; both the judges and jurymen were examined before the Council, and a list of Lilburne's violent expressions on his trial having been laid before Parliament, an order was made that, despite of his acquittal, he should be imprisoned in the Tower. This severity offended many, who complained with justice that men who had taken up arms to support the liberties of Englishmen were now trampling down the same freedom to satisfy their own resentment. Lilburne was sent to Elizabeth Castle, in Jersey, where he remained some years in confinement.¹

The members of this Convention-Parliament now earnestly set about reforming abuses. They simplified the public accounts, and provided for the registration of births, marriages, and deaths; but they were ridiculed for their fanatical language, and excited the apprehensions of the clergy by their opposition to the system of tithes. Their injudicious zeal, indeed, soon incurred the enmity of every powerful party in the country.

Cromwell soon perceived the necessity of discharging such rash innovators, many of whom were men of extreme opinions both in politics and religion. On December 12, in the absence of the more violent Reformers, a member in his confidence proposed that for this Parliament, as then constituted, to continue sitting would not be beneficial to the Commonwealth, and that therefore it was desirable that they should restore to the Lord-General the powers which he had entrusted to them. This being duly seconded, the Speaker, preceded by the mace, and followed by nearly fifty members, walked to Whitehall, and there signed a form of resignation, which was presented to Cromwell; but he affected an air of surprise. The act of resignation was afterwards completed by the names of a majority of the assembly. This Convention having been brought to an end with more appearance of legality than the late Parliament, Cromwell called his council of officers and others of note to determine upon the next step. The excitement in London was great.

On the 16th the new Instrument of Government was made known, by which the office and authority of a sovereign were given to Cromwell, with the title of Lord Protector of the realm. That due respect might be paid to the new installation,

¹ Carlyle mentions his death at Eltham in Kent, in 1657, after he had been some time at liberty. He died a Quaker.

he proceeded on that day in his carriage to Westminster Hall, escorted by five regiments of foot soldiers and three of cavalry, preceded by the corporation and the judges. A chair of state had been prepared for him in the Court of Chancery. Cromwell was dressed in a suit and cloak of black velvet, and wore a broad gold band round his hat. Colonel Lambert, who was the appointed spokesman, noticed the dissolution of the late Parliament, and after stating the need of a strong government, prayed his Excellency the Lord-General, in the name of the army and the three kingdoms, to accept the office of Protector, to which Cromwell assented, with the semblance of reluctance. The new 'Instrument of Government' was read, which vested the legislative power in a Lord Protector and Parliament, yet provided that any parliamentary enactment should become law, even without the Protector's concurrence, at the end of twenty days, should the House not approve his reasons for dissent. The Parliament also was not to be prorogued or dissolved within five months of its assembling, unless by its own consent; and must be succeeded by a new Parliament in less than three years after a dissolution. The number of members was fixed at four hundred for England, thirty for Scotland, and thirty for Ireland. Most of the smaller boroughs were disfranchised, and the number of county members was increased. The right of voting was granted to all persons possessing property of the value of £200, excepting known Royalists or *delinquents*, and Roman Catholics. Laws could only be made and taxes imposed by the consent of Parliament; but the power of treating with foreign states, of making peace or war, and directing the army and navy, vested in the Lord Protector, acting with the advice of the Council. All Christians were to be protected in the exercise of their religion, with the exception, however, of Prelatists, Papists, and those who could be accused of encouraging immorality. Parliament was appointed to meet on September 3 following, and in the meantime the Lord Protector had the power of raising the needful supplies, and of making requisite ordinances, which Parliament should confirm. When this important paper had been read, Cromwell, with great solemnity, swore to observe and administer all its articles; and Lambert, falling on his knees, offered him 'a civic sword in the scabbard,' which Cromwell accepted, laying aside his own, to signify that he would in future govern by constitutional not by military authority. He then placed himself in the chair of state, put on his hat while the rest stood uncovered, received the Great Seal from the commissioners, and the sword from

the lord mayor, which he restored, and after this display of sovereign authority, returned in state to Whitehall.¹

The new form of government was publicly proclaimed with ceremonies resembling those usual at the beginning of a new reign; but Cromwell's elevation was disapproved by a large party, especially by the Levellers and Anabaptists. Among his former companions in arms were many stubborn Republicans, who looked with aversion on the general whom they had previously revered, when he accepted dignity so nearly like that of a king. Some of the ministers threatened him from the pulpit with a speedy downfall. Cromwell retaliated by removing some of his most violent opponents either from their commissions in the army or their ministry in the Church. Even Major-General Harrison, who had assisted in the dissolution of the Long Parliament, now declared strongly against him, and was consequently ordered 'to go home to Staffordshire, and be quiet.'² The plots of the Royalists were more dangerous than those of the Republicans. They had remained passive since their defeat at Worcester, but when the supreme authority was vested in Cromwell they were encouraged to plot against a life on which the government so entirely depended.

In the spring of 1654 a proclamation was sent over from Paris, attributed to either Charles or Clarendon, notwithstanding their subsequent disavowal, which promised a pension to any person who would take the life of 'a certain base mechanic-fellow, by name Oliver Cromwell, who has usurped our throne.' 'If we have not,' says Hallam, 'positive evidence of Charles's concurrence in this scheme; it would be preposterous to suppose that he would have been withheld by any moral hesitation.'³ Accordingly, a plot was discovered for attacking the Protector on his way from Hampton Court, for complicity in which a young Royalist gentleman named Gerard, and Vowel, a school-master at Islington, were tried and executed.

On the day of Gerard's execution, the same punishment was inflicted on a young nobleman only nineteen years of age, Don Pantaleon de Sa, brother of the Portuguese ambassador. In support of a private quarrel, in which a large number of the ambassador's retainers were implicated, this gentleman had caused a serious fray in the streets of London, resulting in the death of a bystander, and the severe wounding of many persons.

¹ Lingard, xi. 16-19.

² Carlyle, iii. 3. Lingard states that Harrison and two violent Anabaptist preachers were sent to the Tower.—Lingard, xi. 20.

³ Such a design is frequently mentioned, without any disapprobation, by Clarendon in his private letters.—Hallam, i. 667.

‘After a clear trial in the Upper-Bench Court, half the jury being foreigners,’¹ sentence of death was passed, much to the amazement, it is said, of the young Portuguese nobleman, whose brother pleaded in vain the privileges of ambassadors. Cromwell’s severity made no alteration, however, in the relations of the two countries. The ambassador signed the treaty between England and Portugal just before leaving London on the day of his brother’s execution.

The same sentence had a few weeks previously been executed on an aged Roman Catholic clergyman, named Southwell, who, *thirty-seven* years before (in the reign of James I.), had been convicted at Lancaster and banished. How far any recent treason against the Protector could be imputed to this ecclesiastic we know not. Judgment of death was pronounced, and Cromwell allowed the execution to take place, notwithstanding the urgent solicitations of the ambassadors from France and Spain for his pardon. Two hundred carriages and a crowd of horsemen followed the hurdle on which Southwell was drawn as a traitor to execution.’²

In Scotland, the number of Royalists amounted to some thousands, and they were encouraged by communications with Charles himself. Middleton, who carried a royal commission to Scotland, was defeated by the officers of the Protector, but the principal Royalists, by prompt submission, obtained mercy from General Monk. Before the end of the contest Cromwell published three ordinances, in which he, by his own supreme authority, incorporated Scotland with England, absolved the Scots from their allegiance to Charles Stuart, abolished both the royal office and the Scottish Parliament, and granted a free pardon to the nation, reserving certain exceptions.

Thus was the whole frame of the Scottish constitution subverted; but past experience and military supremacy imposed silence, even upon the Kirk. The successive victories won by the English fleet in the summer of 1653 had at length lowered the lofty pretensions of the Dutch, and after a long negotiation a treaty of peace with Holland was signed in April, 1654. The right of searching Dutch vessels was abandoned, but it was stipulated that the same respect should be paid to the flag of the Commonwealth as had been shown to that of the

¹ Carlyle, iii. 16. Guizot says that this affair gave Cromwell an opportunity of showing to foreigners the impartial justice of English law. It is singular that the affray for which Pantaleon suffered death arose from his quarrelling just previously with that Major Gerard who was beheaded on the same day.—Lingard, xi. 22.

² *Ib.*

king, and that neither Commonwealth should harbour or aid the enemies of the other. The conclusion of peace with the United Provinces and the formation of an alliance among the Protestant States were the principal successes of Cromwell. He also arranged a treaty in June, 1654, with Denmark, the Swiss Protestant cantons, and several of the petty princes of Germany.¹

The war in which the rival kingdoms of France and Spain had been so long engaged induced both these powers to pay court to the Protector. The Spanish ambassador even ventured to promise Cromwell his sovereign's support, should he be desirous to rise a step higher, and assume the royal title.

The royal family of France, owing to their connexion with the Stuarts, were ill-disposed towards the present government of England, and the assistance which Admiral Blake had recently given the Spaniards in the capture of Dunkirk was resented as an unprovoked injury; yet Cardinal Mazarin, the ruling minister in France, found it expedient to propose a treaty to his Highness the Protector. The terms in which Louis XIV., then only sixteen years of age, should address Cromwell were a subject of discussion. The Protector would not accept the designation of 'Mon Cousin,' and wished to be called 'Mon Frère;' this being declined by the French, as a compromise, 'Monsieur le Protecteur' was agreed to.²

Cromwell received ambassadors with all the dignity of a sovereign. He and his family occupied apartments at Whitehall, long appropriated to the King of England, and lately newly furnished with magnificence. His chair of state was placed on a platform three steps above the floor of the banqueting-room. Mrs. Hutchinson, who did not disguise her dislike, acknowledges in her memoirs that although some of his family could not well conform to their new rank, 'he had much natural greatness, and well became the place he had usurped.' But it was necessary for him to confirm his power by the sanction of a Parliament, and yet the nation was not so unanimously in his favour as to allow him to confide in a free election. Fourteen years had elapsed since the nation had enjoyed the power of electing its own Parliament, and the new system now proposed was borrowed from that suggested by Vane to the remnant of the Long Parliament on the eve of its dissolution. During the Protectorate, dating from December 16 to September 3, Cromwell had passed many measures for the delay of which the late Parliament had been reproached. Needful reforms

¹ Guizot, ii. 67. A treaty was also concluded with the Queen of Sweden.

² Lingard, xi. 28. Louis XIV. came to the throne in 1643, at five years of age.

had been effected in the finances, the prisons, and the police. Duels had been prohibited, public amusements were put under regulation, and statutes for the improvement of University education bore witness to the intelligent activity of Cromwell's administration.¹

It is said that government influence was used in the election of members; the law had already guarded against the nomination of active Royalists, called 'open Malignants.' Yet, although the greater number of the representatives is believed to have consisted of 'constitutional Presbyterians' and neutrals, there was a considerable diversity amongst them. Lenthall, the old Speaker, who had sat in the chair in 1642, when Charles I. dared to enter the House in search of the five members, and who still presided on April 20, 1653, when Cromwell closed it, was again a member; so were Lord Herbert, son of the Royalist Earl of Worcester, Lord Fairfax, and old Sir Harry Vane, both the young Cromwells, and Fleetwood, the Protector's son-in-law, as well as some known Republicans, Bradshaw, Scott, Haselrig, and others. The Parliament had been summoned to meet on September 3, which Cromwell accounted his 'fortunate day,' but, as that was a Sunday, no business was done. The members met 'at sermon' in Westminster Abbey, and afterwards attended the Protector in the Painted Chamber, when he addressed them.²

On Monday, September 4, the Protector rode in state from Whitehall to the Abbey, preceded by some hundreds of officers and gentlemen. In the coach with Cromwell were his son Henry and Colonel Lambert, both uncovered. The members who had assembled heard another sermon, and afterwards another address from the Protector in the Painted Chamber. Cromwell's appearance was a contrast to the parade of the procession. In the dress of a country gentleman, he was distinguished merely by the privilege of wearing his hat. His speech was very long, and contained many Scriptural quotations. He described the state of the country at the close of the last Parliament, how it was agitated by Levellers and religious enthusiasts, who threatened to destroy all distinctions, and by 'swarms of Jesuits;' and when a naval war with Holland absorbed all the resources of the state. He had been able to effect many improvements: the taxes had been reduced; judges of talent and integrity had been raised to the bench; and 'a stop had been put to that heady way for every man who pleased to become a preacher.' He also described with satisfaction the treaties

¹ Guizot, ii. 56-57.

² Carlyle, iii. 17.

which he had concluded with foreign states. At the close of this speech Cromwell withdrew, desiring the members to repair to their own House and choose their Speaker. After a short debate the old Speaker Lenthall was again nominated. Had this Parliament availed itself of the extensive powers conferred on it by the 'Instrument of Government,' and heartily endeavoured to 'heal and settle the nation,' the Commonwealth might have prospered at home as well as abroad. But, instead of assisting the Protector in the task which he had undertaken, it presumed to discuss the validity of his installation. After only three days' transaction of business it appointed a committee to determine whether the House approved of the administration of government by 'a single person and a Parliament.'

This attempt to introduce discussion concerning the fundamental authority by which the Parliament had been summoned, was likely to aggravate rather than abate discord. 'The despotism of a wise man' has been said by a friend to liberty to be 'more tolerable than that of political or religious fanatics,' and the usurpation of Cromwell 'was a necessary and wholesome usurpation,' under existing circumstances, securing the nation 'from the mischievous lunacy of the Anabaptists.'¹

Cromwell could not wait in patience for the end of a debate which, after lasting four days, might conclude by condemning his authority. On September 12 the members found the doors of the House guarded by soldiers, and were desired to attend the Protector in the Painted Chamber. Cromwell received them, attended as usual by his officers, and in a long address described the difficulties of his position, and the circumstances which had placed in his hands that power which duty required him to use in the prevention of bloodshed and confusion. This authority had been approved by the officers, by the city of London, by many cities, boroughs, and counties, and also by many notable persons, including the judges, who had declared that without commissions from him they could not safely administer the law. 'When,' continued Cromwell, 'I called you a free Parliament, I thought it was understood that I was the Protector, and that you were summoned by my authority, which I hold by a good right.' He declared some things relating to government to be 'fundamental,' others only 'circumstantial.' It was fundamental for the government to vest in a single person and a Parliament; also that Parliament should not sit in perpetuity. Liberty of conscience was, he declared, 'a natural right, and he who would have it, ought to give it.' He then required them

¹ Hallam, i. 662.

to sign an engagement not to interfere again with the settlement of the government, on which conditions alone they could resume their places. About a hundred signed immediately, and three hundred more before the month ended.¹ ‘Deep Republicans, Bradshaw, Haselrig, Thomas Scott, and the like,’ indignantly refused. The Protector molested no man for his recusancy, but Harrison and other suspected persons were ‘a little looked after.’ The Parliament resumed its functions nearly as before. Still, although deprived of one-fourth of its members, viz., of those who had refused to sign the paper, the majority were jealous of Cromwell, and anxious to limit his authority.² An accident which befel the Protector when trying some new horses in the park suggested the need of determining on the order of government in case of his death; and Colonel Lambert, after describing the evils of elective monarchy, proposed that the office of Protector should be made hereditary in the family of Cromwell. This, however, was negatived on a division, by two hundred votes to eighty. Cromwell had other reasons for discontent. The Parliament neglected business, reduced the sum destined for the payment of the troops, and were tyrannical towards heretics. John Biddle, called by Lingard ‘the father of English Unitarians,’ had been previously imprisoned by the Long Parliament, and severer measures were in preparation against him.³

According to the ‘Instrument of Government,’ this Parliament must sit at least five months, which period would expire on February 3. But the Protector was impatient of delay, and, interpreting the term by lunar instead of calendar months, he dissolved Parliament on January 22. Their dissensions had, as he reproachfully told the members, encouraged the Cavaliers to plot against the Commonwealth, and the Levellers to intrigue. ‘A universal rising of Royalists combined with Anabaptists’ was indeed in progress! Levellers, disgusted with Cromwell’s military ascendancy, were showing their preference even for Charles Stuart, who had left his little court at Cologne for Middleburg on the Dutch coast, to be in readiness.⁴ On February 12, Major Wildman, one of the last elected Parliament, who had been excluded when he refused to recognise the Protectorate, was arrested when employed on an inflammatory pamphlet addressed to the ‘People of England in Arms against

¹ Carlyle, iii. 61; Guizot, ii. 100–103.

² Lingard, xi. 47.

³ He was again arrested the next year, and sent to the Scilly Isles ‘for life,’ but liberated by Cromwell in 1658. He died in Newgate after the Restoration.—Ib., note.

⁴ Carlyle, iii. 97.

the 'Tyrant Oliver Cromwell,' and was imprisoned in Chepstow Castle.

Colonel Harrison and others were also sent to prison, but not tried, Cromwell, as some say, hoping always that they might yet be reconciled to him.¹ Possibly he feared the result of an open trial. In fact, before this time, some persons had refused to pay taxes.

A merchant named Cony refused in November, 1654, to pay the Customs dues, on the pretext that they were illegally imposed by the Protector, because unsanctioned by Parliament. The Commissioners of Customs fined Cony £500 for his refusal. This also he refused to pay, and Cromwell, who had been on friendly terms with this merchant, remonstrated personally with him, when Cony reminded the Protector of the words which he had himself used in the Long Parliament: 'The subject who submits to an illegal impost is more an enemy of his country than the tyrant who imposes it.' Cromwell grew angry, and sent Cony to prison. He claimed his liberation by writ of *habeas corpus*, and three eminent lawyers pleaded so strongly in his favour that Cromwell was alarmed lest taxes should be refused generally, and the lawyers were temporarily imprisoned. Sir Peter Wentworth, who had also refused to pay taxes on the same ground, was induced to yield by the earnest commands of Cromwell.² But whilst the Protector had been drawn on to despotic courses, the Royalists were openly stirring up war. A plan had been laid for simultaneous risings in various counties, and the Earl of Rochester and Sir Joseph Wagstaff arrived from the continent to take command of the insurgents.

On the night of March 11 the quiet city of Salisbury was entered by Wagstaff, Colonel Penruddock, and about 200 other Cavaliers. It was assize time; Wagstaff seized the judges in their beds, and on the morrow ordered the High Sheriff to proclaim King Charles, which he refused to do. Wagstaff would have proceeded to hang the sheriff and the judges if he had not been opposed by Penruddock, who urged, that those who wished to restore the violated laws of their country ought not to begin with an outrage. Discouraged by their want of success at Salisbury, the insurgents proceeded into Devonshire, still unaided by the people, who were generally averse to the royal cause. At South Molton they were overtaken by Captain Crook at the head of a troop of cavalry, and, after a faint resistance, Penruddock and some fifty others were taken prisoners,

¹ Carlyle.

² Guizot, ii. 138-141.

Wagstaff and the rest having the good fortune to escape. The Republicans generally, even when adverse to the Protector, were unwilling to see him succeeded by Charles, and the risings were everywhere easily suppressed. Lord Rochester, however, succeeded in threading his way through a thousand dangers on his return to the court of the exiled sovereign at Cologne.¹ Penruddock and others were executed, and a large number of prisoners were sent to Barbadoes.

Measures of precaution succeeded. Ejected ministers of the Church of England, if Royalists, were forbidden to act as schoolmasters, to preach or to read the Church service; all priests of the Church of Rome were ordered to leave England under pain of death. Cavaliers and Catholics were forbidden to reside within twenty miles of London, and no newspapers were allowed to be published without the permission of the government. A tax of a tenth part of landed property was also inflicted on all who had borne arms or openly joined the king's cause. These measures, however they might be justified by the late attempts, greatly increased Cromwell's unpopularity. To prevent future insurrections, all England was now divided into ten districts, the command of each being assigned to a Major-General, with authority to eject ill-affected ministers, and to send to prison all suspected persons. Against the power of these officers there was no appeal except to the Protector in Council.

'To govern according to law,' says Hallam, 'may sometimes be a usurper's wish, but can seldom be in his power.' The Protector abandoned all thought of it.² The major-generals were bitterly hostile to the Royalists, and in some cases so far exceeded their instructions as much to increase the ill-will cherished towards a government which thus disappointed the aspirations of the lovers of freedom. By zealously discovering all the enemies of the government, these officers contrived to raise the revenue, but the measure brought about the ruin of Cromwell's power.

During the year 1654, two naval armaments, which had long attracted the attention of neighbouring nations, sailed from the English ports with sealed orders. Their destination was a mystery. When some of the sailors' wives pursued the Protector through the streets, inquiring whither their husbands would be sent, he replied with a smile, that the French and Spanish ambassadors were also willing to give much if they could know. When at length the objects for which these fleets had been

¹ Lingard, xi. 53.

² Hallam, i. 668.

prepared were made known, it was ascertained that Admiral Penn and General Venables had been ordered to sail for Spanish America, in order to obtain an establishment in St. Domingo, Cuba, and any part of the continent which was then in the possession of Spain. The immense wealth which Spain derived from her American possessions excited the rapacity of neighbouring nations. It was urged in defence of these hostile acts against a power with which no war had been declared, that Spain had wrongfully obtained these countries, and employed her wealth in fostering Popery in Europe. The hope of wealth and glory, also the employment of mutinous Republicans who might have disturbed the government at home, appear to have been the incitements to this and another similar expedition. The latter had been undertaken by Admiral Blake the previous autumn, under pretext of reparation for damages done to the English by the Duke of Florence, the Dey of Tunis, and other Powers. The piratical squadron at Tunis was destroyed, but Blake was disappointed in his hope of capturing the Spanish fleet bringing home the riches of the West Indies. Even whilst Cromwell was preparing his hostile expeditions, the court of Madrid pressed for a closer alliance with the English government, yet evaded allowing to the English settlers in Spain that full religious liberty which Cromwell required.¹

The Grand Duke of Tuscany received a demand for redress in relation to merchant vessels seized by Prince Rupert in 1650, an event which excited great dismay in Italy. The ships had been sold in the Papal States, and so strongly did Blake enforce the claim for compensation, that the Pope assisted the Grand Duke in raising the requisite sum. The fleet destined for the West Indies sailed under less capable commanders, and proved in most respects a failure, owing to dissensions and incapacity. The attempt to obtain possession of the island of Hispaniola (or St. Domingo) failed, and Jamaica, at that time 'a poor unpopulous island,' was then accounted little worth the trouble of the taking or the keeping.² Indeed, so great was Cromwell's dissatisfaction with the two commanders, Penn and Venables, that on their return they were detained for a few weeks in the Tower, and underwent an examination.

About this time, news arrived from Piedmont of religious oppression, which greatly stirred the mind of Cromwell. The valleys of Savoy had long contained a poor, Protestant population, called Vaudois, or Waldenses, on the conversion of whom to Catholicism the Duke of Savoy had lately set his

¹ Guizot, ii. 195.

² Carlyle, iii. 123.

heart. For many years these simple, industrious herdsmen had been left undisturbed in the exercise of their faith and worship; but in the winter of 1654 missionary friars appeared amongst them, who were ill-received by the people; these were succeeded by six regiments of Catholic soldiery, with an order that the people should either be converted or forced to quit the country.

‘They could not be converted all at once;’ neither would they resolve in winter on leaving the country which from time immemorial had been the home of their race. They were accordingly driven forth to seek shelter in French Dauphiné, or wherever they could find it. A treaty with France was ready for signature, and was important to England at the time, but Cromwell refused to sign it till the King of France and Cardinal Mazarin would promise succour to the Vaudois.¹ He sent urgent expostulations on their behalf also to the rulers of Sweden, Denmark, and Holland, maintaining that the right to liberty of conscience ought to be held inviolable.² Narratives of the cruelties perpetrated and prints of harrowing scenes were widely circulated in England, a day was appointed for public humiliation and sympathy, and the large sum of £38,241 was subscribed for the relief of the sufferers, to which Cromwell contributed £2,000 from his own purse. The Protector’s intercession so far availed that the Duke of Savoy agreed to an amnesty and to confirm the Vaudois in their ancient privileges, after which Cromwell signed a treaty with France, containing a secret stipulation for the exclusion from that kingdom of Charles Stuart, his brother, and their adherents.³

On the same day that this treaty was made known in London war was proclaimed with Spain. Disappointed of assistance from France, Charles was induced to rouse himself from his habitual life of indolent dissipation, and offered himself to the King of Spain as a valuable ally in respect of his influence over the English and Irish regiments in the continental service. Charles found a willing instrument in Colonel Saxby, till lately a ‘Leveller,’ a morose and unprincipled man, who was ready in any way to oppose Cromwell. In spite of the vigilance of the English government, Saxby distributed inflammatory pamphlets and took journeys to Brussels and

¹ Carlyle, iii. 103–104. Admirable letters sent by Cromwell to the King of France and the Duke of Savoy are given by Guizot.—Appendix to vol. ii.

² Milton’s 19th Sonnet nobly testifies his sympathy:—

‘Avenge, O Lord, thy slaughtered saints, whose bones
Lie scattered on the Alpine mountains cold.’

³ Lingard, xi. 65.

Madrid, offering the aid of his party for Cromwell's overthrow. Seven thousand Spaniards were to invade England, and large sums were sent for distribution among the discontented Republicans.¹

The Protector's position was full of difficulties. The war with Spain was unpopular because it interfered with commerce; the failure of the attempt in Hispaniola raised discontent, and yet the want of money rendered it again necessary to summon a Parliament. The whole nation was in a ferment; Sir Harry Vane, who had published a pamphlet on the principles of Republican government, was excluded; and considerable care was taken during the elections to enforce objections against all who could be accused of either immorality or delinquency.² In spite, however, of all care, some of the new representatives were decided opponents of Cromwell.

On September 17, the Protector again met Parliament at Westminster Abbey; after listening to a sermon, they all went to the Painted Chamber, where Cromwell delivered a long discourse, concerning the best way to preserve the nation, now threatened with anarchy and invasion. He spoke much against Spain, and of the dangers arising from the Cavaliers, some of whom laid plots for his assassination. He vindicated the establishment of major-generals, admitted their unpopularity, but justified the late arrests as needful for the preservation of the peace. When, after this address, the new members proceeded to the House, they found there a military guard, which excluded all who had not previously been furnished with a certificate from the Council. This arbitrary measure caused much discontent. Although the proceeding was justified by the 'Instrument of Government,' some of those excluded published indignant appeals to the people.

Satisfactory news soon arrived from the squadron, commanded by Blake and Montague, who had taken a Spanish treasure-fleet; and, at the beginning of November, eight-and-thirty waggon-loads of silver arrived at the Tower from Portsmouth, to be coined into English money. General rejoicing also ensued when, at the beginning of 1657, the power of the major-generals was abolished.³

The Jews, who had been expelled from England in 1290,

¹ Carlyle, iii. 152; Lingard, xi. 72.

Lingard, p. 78. Vane was summoned before the Council of State, and, refusing to pledge himself not to attack the government, was sent to Carisbrook Castle, in the Isle of Wight, in September, 1656; he was liberated at the end of December following.—Forster's 'Life of Vane,' p. 174.

³ Carlyle, iii. 198. Respecting the major-generals, see a note in Lingard, p. 87.

had since that time enjoyed no legal protection in this country. Towards the end of 1655, a learned Jew of Amsterdam, named Manasseh Ben Israel, appealed to Cromwell on the subject, having tried successive Parliaments in vain. Cromwell was favourable to the application, and summoned a conference from the different professions for its consideration; but he found it impossible to overcome the arguments of theologians or the jealousy of the merchants. Yet, although unable to grant them comprehensive privileges, he authorised a certain number of Jews to settle in London, where they built a synagogue, and proved some of the most peaceable supporters of the government.¹ After the exclusion of the obnoxious members, the Parliament appeared anxious to satisfy Cromwell by approving the war with Spain and by raising the needful supplies; but an instance of bigoted cruelty which equalled the vindictive proceedings of Laud in the reign of Charles soon excited the Protector's indignation. James Naylor, a retired soldier, who had joined the Quakers, appears to have conducted himself at Bristol with frantic enthusiasm. The House desired a committee to examine into the case, and finding Naylor guilty of blasphemy, it discussed whether or not to put him to death. But Colonel Lambert defended Naylor, who had been his quartermaster, and was a man of blameless life. His life was saved by a small majority of votes; but the punishments inflicted were merciless. He was to stand in the pillory, be whipped through the streets of London, have his tongue bored with a hot iron, and further undergo imprisonment with hard labour. The first part of this atrocious sentence had been executed, when Cromwell wrote to the Speaker, inquiring 'the ground and reason' on which the House had proceeded in the case, in which he had taken no part. They had arbitrarily infringed upon the functions of the law-courts.²

On January 19, 1657, Parliament was informed that a plot had been discovered, the device of a Republican soldier named Miles Sindescombe, to take the life of Cromwell; Sindescombe, like Saxby, was an agent sent over by the united Cavaliers and Spaniards to prepare for the invasion of England. The House appointed a public thanksgiving for the safety of the Protector. Sindescombe, when tried and condemned to suffer death as a traitor, died of poison.

¹ Lingard, p. 77, note.

² All these cruelties were executed, although Cromwell showed his disapproval. Naylor had sympathising friends, who tried to alleviate his sufferings. He was afterwards liberated. He died in 1660.—Lingard, p. 84.

A serious debate took place at this time in Parliament respecting further change in the form of government. It was proposed to institute another assembly resembling the old House of Lords, and increase Cromwell's power, with the title of king, to be hereditary in his family. This proposal, made by Alderman Sir Christopher Pack, one of the Members for London, was supported by lawyers, but opposed generally by the heads of the army. On February 27, a deputation of a hundred officers went to Cromwell to express the dismay with which they had heard of a plan which they thought a scandal to the cause, full of danger to the Protector, and likely to lead to the restoration of the Stuarts. Cromwell, in reply, appeared not to desire the title, which he called but 'a feather in a hat,' but, reverting to the late arbitrary conduct of the Parliament against Naylor, declared that there was need of a balancing power.¹ Parliament continued the debate on this question all through March; and at last, on the 31st, the Speaker, attended by all the members, proceeded to Whitehall to present their long 'Petition and Advice' that the title of king should be given to the Protector. Cromwell, surrounded by the principal officers of his government, received the members in that Banqueting Hall through which, eight years before, Charles had passed to the scaffold. The Speaker made a long address, with quotations from Aristotle, the Bible, Magna Charta, &c., and enlarged on the advantages of a regal title and of a second House; but Cromwell asked for delay before giving his answer to so weighty a matter. During the month of April he held frequent conferences on the subject, and appears to have vacillated. A report, promulgated at the beginning of May, that Cromwell had determined to accept the royal title, excited the opposition of his most attached friends, of Colonel Lambert, of Fleetwood, who had married his daughter, and of Desborough, who had married his sister, and who threatened to separate themselves from his service for ever if he should take a step so repugnant to their principles. They had risked their lives against monarchy, and declared themselves still ready to do so. Cromwell saw that it was necessary to disclaim the desire of royalty. Mrs. Hutchinson, who was an attentive observer, says that he 'would have been king, but for the fear of quitting his generalship.' Under these circumstances, a fresh inauguration of the Protector's office was resolved upon. On June 26, on a platform raised at the upper end of Westminster Hall, Cromwell again appeared, standing by a magnificent chair of state, and was invested by the Speaker with a purple mantle

¹ Carlyle, iii. 217; Guizot, ii. 295.

lined with ermine, was presented with a costly Bible, whilst a sword was buckled to his side and a sceptre of massive gold placed in his hand. Nothing was wanting but the crown. When, after prayer, Cromwell seated himself in the chair, with the foreign ambassadors, the lord mayor, and other functionaries on either side, the trumpets sounded, and the heralds proclaimed the style of the new sovereign. After this ceremony, the Commons adjourned for six months, to allow time for the appointment of the 'other House.' This was to be chosen by Cromwell, although the persons raised to that dignity must be approved by the Commons. The supreme authority was not yet rendered hereditary in the Cromwell family, but the choice of his immediate successor was given to the Protector.¹ Before this last grand ceremonial took place, the brave Admiral Blake had fought his last battle against the Spaniards off Santa Cruz, where he achieved a victory which raised his fame throughout Europe. Blake had been long at sea, and was wasted by disease; he expired on August 7, just as his ship was entering Plymouth Harbour. His services received a public acknowledgment by his interment in Westminster Abbey.²

In endowing Cromwell with the power of nominating the House of Lords, a degree of authority was entrusted to him which kings have never possessed. But to plant anew an 'old peerage of descent with its thousand years of strength,' was totally out of his power.³ The need had been perceived of an authority between him and the House of Commons, and an effort, which proved for the most part fruitless, was made to rally in his favour the old members of the aristocracy. Two family alliances appeared favourable. In November, 1657, his daughter Mary was married to Lord Falconberg, and his daughter Frances to Mr. Rich, grandson and heir of the Earl of Warwick. Public functionaries legal and military, country gentlemen and opulent citizens, numbering sixty-three besides the judges, were appointed to form the new House, but only one nobleman, Lord Eure, took his seat on the day of assembling. Lord Warwick, indeed, notwithstanding his grandson's connexion, declared that he would not sit in the same chamber with Colonel Pride, or with Colonel Hewson, who had once been a cobbler. Sir Arthur Haselrig, who had been excluded from the Parliament in 1656 for want of a certificate, was nominated

¹ Lingard, xi. 95-97.

² In the next reign this was considered a distinction too flattering for a Republican hero, and the coffin was removed to the churchyard.

³ Carlyle, iii. 318.

to the House of Lords, but declined to sit there, claiming and obtaining at length his seat among the Commons. 'This was,' says Carlyle, 'an ominous symptom.'¹ But divisions still continued, and on February 4, 1658, the Protector, having summoned the Commons to meet him in the House of Lords, dissolved his third and last Parliament.

Strong measures were indeed required, for the Republican party were loud in their discontent, and the plan for a Royalist invasion was ripening. A tract called 'Killing no Murder,' printed in Holland in the last year, had been largely circulated in England, and had excited men's minds more than any other work of the age. Cromwell assembled his officers at Whitehall, and explained to them the dangers of his position, and they declared their willingness to live and die with him. He next applied to the lord mayor and Common Council, requesting that the city force might be made ready. Many arrests were made in the country; a new court of justice was established according to the Act passed in 1656; and before it Sir Henry Slingsby, who had endeavoured to corrupt the garrison at Hull, exhibiting a commission from Charles Stuart; Dr. Hewet, a clergyman of the English Church, a zealous Royalist agent; and Mr. Mordaunt, brother of the Earl of Peterborough, who had corresponded with the Duke of Ormond, and had distributed royal commissions, were brought to trial. Slingsby and Hewet were beheaded on June 8, although great exertions were made to save their lives, and although Lord Falconberg was Slingsby's nephew. Mordaunt was acquitted, and most of the other prisoners were tried before the usual courts.² Colonel Hutchinson, who had refused to take any part in the government after the expulsion of the members of the Long Parliament, disliking Cromwell's tyranny, but still more detesting the intrigues of the conspirators against him, had warned Cromwell of his danger, for which he warmly thanked him.

The Duke of Ormond, the great friend and counsellor of Charles, had ventured to stay for some weeks in London, where

¹ Vol. iii. 326. Young Mr. Rich, married shortly before to Frances Cromwell, died in February; and in the April following, died his grandfather, the old Earl of Warwick, 'a new grief to the Protector,' with whom he was in most friendly correspondence.—Carlyle, p. 366.

² Some historians have related that Elizabeth, of all Cromwell's daughters the most tenderly beloved, interested herself greatly in favour of Dr. Hewet. Lingard shows reason to doubt this, as Elizabeth wrote to her sister, just after the execution, that they ought to return thanks for deliverance from Hewet's conspiracy, which would have ruined their family and 'the whole nation.'—Lingard, xi. 116, note.

he assumed various disguises. His place of residence was well known to Cromwell, who warned him by a message to depart. Ormond immediately returned to Charles, who was at Bruges, and reported that, although Cromwell had many enemies, there was no present hope of a Royalist restoration.¹ Amidst the manifold difficulties which beset the Protector, arrived the news that the Piedmontese Protestants were again molested, when again his earnest remonstrances with the King of France in their favour arrested their persecution yet another season. Abroad Cromwell's name was a tower of strength, and a glorious success was at this very time attending the allied standards of England and France in the Netherlands, then belonging to Spain.² Cromwell sent two additional regiments to Flanders in the spring of this year. Dunkirk, for which, as an English possession, he had stipulated, surrendered on June 17; and Louis XIV., on entering the town, delivered the keys with his own hand to the English ambassador. The most complimentary relations existed between Louis and the Protector, the King of France sending Cromwell his portrait and a magnificent sword, and his ambassador being received by Cromwell with all the state of royalty.

Constant dread of assassination embittered the Protector's life and obliged him to take the strictest precautions. Although naturally bold and confiding, he now frequently changed his sleeping-room, wore armour under his coat, and was attended by a trusty guard. But his death was now approaching in the course of nature. On August 6, his favourite daughter, Lady Claypole, died after a long illness. Her body lay in state for a day, and was interred in Henry VII.'s chapel, Westminster Abbey, among the tombs of kings. At the end of that month Cromwell returned to Whitehall from Hampton Court, very unwell, and unable to attend to business. The dread of losing their great Protector greatly agitated the multitude who honoured him, and fervent prayers were put up for his recovery. It was on September 3, that 'fortunate day' on which he had gained the victories of Dunbar and Worcester, that Cromwell expired. 'The consternation and astonishment of all people were inexpressible.'³ England remained for a time in passive suspense; Ireland was quiet under Henry Cromwell,

¹ Carlyle, iii. 353.

² By the new and closer treaty concluded between England and France in March, 1657, it was stipulated that France should contribute 20,000 men, and the Lord Protector 6,000 and a sufficient fleet, to reduce the three principal towns on the coast, Gravelines, Mardike, and Dunkirk, the first to belong to France, the two latter to England.

³ Carlyle, iii. 375 (as reported by Lord Falconberg).

and Scotland under General Monk. The 'Humble Petition and Advice,' adopted by Parliament in March, 1657, gave Cromwell the power of nominating his successor, but a sealed paper, in which it was believed that he had appointed his eldest son, could not afterwards be found.

The Council, however, immediately ordered that Richard Cromwell be proclaimed Protector, on the ground that he had been nominated to that office by his father, and no opposition was made. Addresses of adherence and congratulation were sent from the principal towns in England and from the foreign ambassadors; and the court of France did not omit the customary respect to the late Protector's memory. The ceremonial used at the interment of Philip II., the most absolute of kings, is said to have been imitated in the funeral rites performed for Oliver Cromwell. His body lay in state at Somerset House for several weeks, and the effigy which was exhibited when the remains were withdrawn was adorned with a crown.¹

The funeral, which was solemnised on November 23, was attended by all the principal persons in the state, and by the foreign ambassadors; and the vault in which the coffin was deposited was long afterwards distinguished as that of Oliver Cromwell. But although at the moment all appeared to acquiesce in Richard's appointment, the change 'from one beneath the terror of whose name a nation had cowered, and foreign princes grown pale, the first of his age in the field or in council, to a young man fresh from a country life, unused to business, as little a statesman as a soldier,' was soon universally felt.² Although Richard had been appointed by his father Chancellor of the University of Oxford, and lately a member of the new House of Lords, he had chiefly resided in the country, where he was well esteemed even by his Royalist neighbours. 'All that he needed for his high position,' says the contemporary Mrs. Hutchinson, 'were a great spirit and a just title.' The Royalists who met him on friendly terms at bowls and races, could not excuse the want of the latter; it was soon clear that he had inherited but too little of the former. He was ill-suited in fact to 'manage such a perplexed government' as that of England. Even during Oliver's last illness the officers had begun to cabal. They proposed that the office of Lord-General should be separated from that of Protector, and given to Fleetwood, who,

¹ Lingard, xi. 137. In spite of all precautions, it became necessary to inter the body before the day of the funeral, which was done secretly at Westminster Abbey in the vault which had been prepared, and to which the effigy was carried afterwards with due solemnity.

² Hallam, i. 683.

although Richard's brother-in-law, was a strong Republican. Colonel Lambert, too, a vain and ambitious man, who aspired to wield Cromwell's sceptre, threw in his influence with this party.¹ The poverty of the Exchequer embarrassed the new Protector, who had not power to discharge the arrears due to the troops, and complaint was made of the excessive cost of the funeral, amounting to £60,000. The only chance of checking military domination was to assemble a Parliament; and on January 27, 1659, Richard, for the first time, met the members of both Houses at Westminster Abbey. When the Commons were desired to repair to the bar of the House of Lords, a considerable number refused by any sign to admit their inferiority to the other part of the Legislature. Formerly, it was alleged, the property held by the lords balanced the power of the king, but the chief property had since fallen into the hands of commoners. After much debate the Commons consented to transact business with 'the Other House,' but stipulated that no superiority should be claimed by that assembly. Of late frequent conspiracies against the government and threats of insurrection had justified arbitrary arrests; but by a Parliamentary vote a frigate was sent to Jersey for the recall of Major-General Overton, who had been detained there for three years, and four or five hundred horsemen, followed by a crowd of people carrying laurel, escorted him to the House of Commons. A petition was presented to the Protector signed by six hundred military men, who complained of the contempt lately shown to the 'good old cause,' and of the prosecutions of patriots. Richard forwarded the petition to Parliament, where it was disregarded, and the military leaders established a general council of officers, expressed violent Republican opinions, and on April 22 informed him that a crisis had arrived, and that the Parliament must be dissolved either by the civil authority or the sword. If the Protector would stand by the army, they would support him; otherwise he must 'fall, friendless and unpitied.'²

Richard was powerless to resist; and, the proposed dissolution being supported by the majority of his Council, the Parliament was accordingly dissolved on April 22. This was the virtual close of his Protectorate. His power from this time was exercised by Fleetwood and the other principal officers; but as it was requisite to preserve the appearance of civil government, the military council determined on recalling all the surviving members of the famous Long Parliament. With some difficulty forty-two members of that assembly were collected, and the old

¹ Hallam, i. 685.

² Lingard, xi. 146; Hallam, i. 689.

Speaker Lenthall, who had been raised to the Upper House by Cromwell, was induced by much entreaty to take his former place at their head. They passed into the House between two lines of officers, some of whom had, six years before, assisted in their expulsion.

There were also in London about eighty of those Presbyterian members who, just before the king's trial, had been excluded by military force. They now assembled in Westminster Hall, and applied for leave to take their places.¹ But the Republican party still dreaded their Royalist inclinations, and they remained excluded, the House having carried a resolution that none who had refused to sign 'the Engagement' should sit. This was the old pledge exacted from the members by Cromwell, five years before, that they would stand by a government vesting in one person and a Parliament. The House of Lords, aware of its deficient authority, was careful not to interfere in affairs of moment; indeed, it was chiefly occupied in discussing the form of a national catechism and questions of religious ritual.² Addresses arrived from different parts of England which supported the new House of Commons for a few months. Cardinal Mazarin also was ready to acknowledge the English Commonwealth, by whomsoever its authority was administered.³ Meanwhile, desirous alike to close the Protectorate and to render due honour to the Cromwell family, the officers requested Parliament to settle lands of the value of £10,000 on Richard and his heirs, and to bestow a pension of £8,000 on 'her Highness Dowager,' the late Protector's widow. Repeated messages of advice were forwarded before Richard finally left Whitehall and retired to private life. The Council agreed that his private debts, amounting to £29,000, should be paid by the nation, and granted him £2,000 as a present supply. Henry Cromwell had previously retired from the government of Ireland, which was placed in the hands of commissioners. Meanwhile Charles Stuart had been since the death of Oliver Cromwell attentively watching the progress of affairs, and signified to his friends his readiness to pass over into England from the coast of Brittany. In nearly every county Royalists were eager for an opportunity of rising in his favour. Prudence still counselled delay, but at the beginning of August Sir George Booth, who had considerable influence in Cheshire (particularly with the Presbyterians) displayed the royal standard, and called on the people

¹ Lingard, xi. 145-149. They sent a deputation headed by Prynne, the Royalist martyr, and Sir George Booth.

² Lingard, xi. 140.

³ Guizot, i. 167.

to defend their rights 'against the tyranny of an insolent soldiery and a pretended Parliament.' The plot was betrayed by the treachery of Sir Richard Willis, and the Royalists, after taking possession of Chester, were dismayed by the news that Lambert with seven regiments was advancing against them.

The insurgents were quickly put to flight, with the loss of numerous prisoners, among whom were Booth and the Earl of Derby, who had both assumed a disguise. For this victory Parliament voted General Lambert £1,000 as a reward. Before the middle of October the Parliament was again dissolved, and all authority vested in the Council of Officers. The Council did not prove unanimous, and their government was not popular. General Monk, who after the battle of Worcester commanded the army in Scotland, had been long suspected of an inclination to favour the Stuarts, although he carefully concealed his wishes from even his closest associates. In November, Monk assembled the Scottish estates at Berwick, obtained from them £60,000 as the arrears of taxes, and fixed his head-quarters at Coldstream, a town on the Tweed. Yet another attempt was made to strengthen the Republican government. 'A free Parliament' was now the general cry, and the citizens exhorted each other to pay no taxes illegally imposed. After much dissension the officers resolved to call a new Parliament, whereupon Fleetwood surrendered his commission to Lenthal.¹ The restored Parliament attempted to keep the mean between the more extreme Republicans and the Royalists. Orders were given to restrain Lambert and the most active of his associates. The members were even subjected to a new form of oath, abjuring Royalty and the Stuart succession—a vain and unstable protection!

One person at least was aware of Monk's secret wishes, Lord Fairfax, now a Royalist, and regarded in Yorkshire as the leader of the king's friends. On January 1, the Cavaliers in the city of York received Fairfax within the walls. On the 12th, Monk, on his advance into England, stopped to consult with him, and afterwards continued his progress to Westminster. On his route he received several addresses from towns and counties praying him to obtain the admission of the excluded members, and urging that Parliament be delivered from control. When Monk arrived in London on February 3, at the head of 7,000 veterans, he was the arbiter of the realm. He had been a Royalist at the beginning of his career, being taken prisoner by Fairfax in Cheshire, in the year 1644, after which

time he had appeared as an earnest adherent of Cromwell. Soon after his arrival in London, Monk was invited to attend the House to receive the thanks of Parliament for his past exertions; but when, as a councillor of state, he was required to take the oath abjuring the restoration of the Stuarts, he refused to pledge himself against the cause for which he was then secretly at work. He waited for still greater demonstrations of the national wish, while the nation, weary of repeated changes, was longing for the stability of a monarchy. On February 21, those members who had been excluded from Parliament in 1648 assembled at the summons of Monk, who spoke to them in praise of Republican government and the Presbyterian Church, after which they took their places in the House without opposition. At their entrance, Haselrig and some other determined Republicans withdrew. The House then proceeded to repeal the celebrated 'Engagement' which vested authority in a single chamber.¹ Orders were given for the liberation of Sir George Booth and other Royalist prisoners, some of whom had been confined ever since the battle of Worcester. In some places the populace were emboldened to proclaim King Charles, and prayers for him were offered up in several churches. The judges who condemned the late king, and the purchasers of forfeited property, were full of fear. Everyone was looking forward to the king's restoration, yet none could distinctly perceive how the difficulties of such a change would be overcome, and the threatening speeches of the too eager Royalists well nigh frustrated their object.²

On March 16, the remnant of that celebrated 'Long Parliament,' which first assembled nearly twenty years before, put a voluntary end to its proceedings. General Monk at this time received a flattering letter from Charles, in reply to which he recommended the king to prepare proposals which might be submitted to a new Parliament, containing a comprehensive promise of pardon, confirming the present distribution of property, and granting liberty of conscience. So cautious was Monk that after he had read this paper to the royal messenger, Sir John Grenville, he threw it into the fire, telling Grenville that he might acquaint the king by memory with its purport.³

¹ Lingard, x. 347, xi. 178; Hallam, i. 703, note. The Engagement was repealed on March 13, 1660.

² Hallam, i. 706, note. On March 15, a man mounted by a ladder to the front of the Royal Exchange, effaced the Latin inscription which announced that freedom was restored to England in 1648, and, flinging up his cap, cried 'God bless King Charles!' the crowd applauding him.—See 'Pepys's Diary,' i. 45, and Guizot, ii. 166, 382.

³ Lingard, xi. 181.

Charles received this intimation at Brussels in a transport of delight, but the letter which, agreeably to Monk's request, was prepared for the next Parliament limited the proposed amnesty by leaving room for further stipulations. Papers were transmitted to Monk separately addressed to the Speaker of the House of Commons, the House of Lords, Admiral Montague and the navy, General Monk himself and the army, and to the lord mayor and the city; all of which Monk retained until he judged that the time was ripe for their delivery. Writs had been issued for a new Parliament, in which opposing parties made every effort to obtain a preponderance. The Presbyterians were the most numerous, but were divided in their views. Part dreaded the king's return from fear of the restoration of episcopacy, while another and still larger part hoped to fetter the coming king with restrictions such as despair alone could have forced upon his father. There was yet a third party, including the most active partisans, which inclined towards a moderate episcopacy, and hoped to bury the memory of their past actions under present declarations of loyalty.¹

The Republicans, who were chiefly numerous in the army, wished to set up General Lambert, who had been confined in the Tower by order of the Council because he refused to give security for his peaceable behaviour. Secure of a friendly reception in the city, Lambert contrived to descend from the prison window, and hastened into Warwickshire, where he collected six troops of horse and some companies of infantry from discontented regiments; but when he was pursued by Colonel Ingoldsby, who had become a Royalist, Lambert's soldiers refused to oppose their former comrades, and he was soon afterwards taken prisoner and again committed to the Tower.

The new Parliament, which met on April 25, was called a Convention, because not legally summoned by any authority. The great majority of the members were Royalists, and Sir Harbottle Grimston, a Presbyterian Royalist, was chosen Speaker.² General Monk joined the assembly as representative of Devonshire, his native county. The Presbyterian peers who were in the Upper House in 1648 now formed a small part of the House of Lords; the peers who had attended Charles at Oxford, and those lately ennobled by the Protector, abstained from presenting themselves for admission.³ Monk, who had continued to dissemble, now perceived that the time

¹ Lingard, xi. 182.

² Hallam, i. 715.

³ Lingard, xi. 185. An order was made on May 4 that no Lords created since

had arrived for the delivery of the royal letters. When, on May 1, Sir John Grenville carried the king's despatches to the two Houses, he received a vote of thanks and a present of £500.

Monk read to his officers the king's address to the army; Montague that to the navy; the Lord Mayor read in Guildhall to the Common Council that sent to the city; and all these returned their thanks and congratulations. To disarm opposition, Charles likewise sent to Parliament an important paper called 'The Declaration of Breda,' from the city in which it was signed, granting a free and general pardon to all, excepting those whom Parliament might afterwards judge fitting to exclude from amnesty; inviting all his subjects to live together henceforth in harmony, promising that such differences of religious belief as were not dangerous to the public peace should be accounted harmless, and that a future Parliament should decide concerning the rights of the present possessors of transferred estates. Leave was given to the officers and men then in the service of their country to retain their situations, on the present terms of remuneration. To this effect was that 'Royal Charter,' on the faith of which Charles was preparing to ascend the throne of his ancestors.¹ Like the previous, it too was to be violated.

It was a delicate task for Parliament to discuss the exceptions to be made to the proffered amnesty. When the Earl of Northumberland, who had taken no part in the judgment of the last king, declared that he disapproved of recriminations, Lord Fairfax said, with manly courage: 'If any man must be excepted, no one deserves it more than myself, for I was general of the army at that time, and had power, had I chosen, to prevent the proceedings against the king.'² In the House of Commons, the four or five members who had signed the condemnation of Charles I. knew that their time had now come. Ingoldsby, who had endeavoured to atone for the past by arresting Lambert, pleaded that he had previously acted under compulsion from Cromwell; Hutchinson, whose general integrity was his best defence, uttered a few manly words respecting that act which he had viewed at the time as a stern necessity, and then left the House, which decided that both

1642 should sit, but this order was rescinded on May 31. The House of Lords on April 27 consisted only of thirty-eight peers.—Hallam.

¹ Lingard, xi. 186.

² See the French ambassador's letter.—Guizot, ii. 427. It appears doubtful whether Fairfax had really that power.

Ingoldsby and Hutchinson ought to be included in the amnesty. Although in some respects blinded by reawakening loyalty, Parliament decided upon the abolition of the Court of Wards, a remnant of feudal oppression, and re-declared the fundamental laws of England, the Great Charter, the Petition of Right, and those statutes by which these safeguards were confirmed.¹

A declaration was passed announcing that, according to ancient precedent, the government of England vested in king, Lords, and Commons; and the House invited Charles to come and receive the crown which was his birthright, desiring that his accession be proclaimed as beginning immediately after the death of his royal father. A few patriotic men wished before it was too late to obtain from the king some further guarantee, dreading lest the indigent followers, about to return in his train, might lead him on to despotic courses. Sir Matthew Hale—that great lawyer, ‘who had resisted all tyrannies,’ that of Cromwell and that of the Commonwealth—and Prynne, the martyr of Archbishop Laud and the intercessor for Charles I., pressed for some stipulations, but were silenced by the influence of Monk, who desired to be the principal instrument in the restoration of monarchy, and urged that unlimited trust should be placed in the king.² So loyal and eager were both the people and the authorities, that a stream of devoted adherents took their departure from London to Breda in haste to proffer allegiance to Charles. Deputations arrived from Parliament, from the corporation of London and from the Presbyterians. Lord Fairfax, who was one of the Parliamentary deputies, was received by Charles with respect. He received no favour, for he would ask for nothing for himself.³

Whilst Charles was still at Breda awaiting the definitive summons, those courts which had lately treated him with coldness tendered congratulations on his good fortune. The States of Holland invited him to revisit the Hague, and he accepted the invitation of his most serviceable allies, who are said to have secretly lent him during his exile more than £300,000—a sum so quickly squandered that the English officers who assisted at his embarkation were surprised at the shabby appearance of all the royal retinue.⁴

¹ ‘These measures,’ says Hallam, ‘though some of them were never completed, proved that the Restoration was not carried forward with so thoughtless a precipitancy and neglect of liberty as has been asserted’ (i. 717).

² Guizot, ii. 227; Lingard, xi. 189.

³ After the Restoration Fairfax again retired to his country-seat in Yorkshire, where he lived in great privacy till his death in 1671. The subsequent turn of events could not have been satisfactory to him.

⁴ ‘Pepys’s Diary,’ i. 81; Guizot, ii. 246. H. Coleridge’s ‘Northern Worthies.’

The Parliament, aware that no loyal assurances would be so acceptable to the spendthrift prince as a grant of money, had already voted that a gift of £50,000 should be immediately paid to him, with £10,000 for the Duke of York, and half that sum for the younger brother, the Duke of Gloucester. It was difficult to provide so large a sum in the exhausted state of the public treasury, and many Royalist members had lavished their resources on the last election, in which from five hundred to two thousand pounds had been given for a seat.¹ The rich traders supplied the deficiency, and £30,000 were paid by the city to be transmitted to the king. When Grenville arrived, the bearer of that treasure in gold and bills of exchange, Charles summoned the Duke of York and his sister the Princess of Orange to the joyful sight. On May 22, Charles took leave of the States-General in their hall with warm expressions of esteem, declaring that he loved them more than all the kings, and commending to their protection his sister and his young nephew, the Prince of Orange—little foreboding that the day might come when that prince would also leave Holland to enter upon the sovereignty of England!²

The vessel which had been sent to convey the king to England still retained its name of 'The Naseby,' after that battle so disastrous to the Stuarts. When Charles came on board he named the ship 'The Royal Charles,' and on May 25 that and its attendant vessels safely arrived at Dover, where some distinguished Royalists and an immense crowd of spectators awaited his landing. The king first gave a courteous reception to General Monk, and at Canterbury, where he remained two days and attended service in the cathedral, he bestowed on him the Order of the Garter. On the morning of the 29th, the new king's birthday, the army, numbering more than 30,000 men, was mustered on Blackheath. When Charles arrived, accompanied by his brothers, and presented himself to the troops with the graceful affability which distinguished him, he was well received, but without exultation. The restoration of the monarchy was known to be necessary, but in the then mood of the soldiers resignation was more prominent than joy. Those to whom they had been most warmly attached were gone, or were now proscribed, or had become Royalists. Warmer greetings

¹ Guizot, ii. 216.

² Lingard speaks of 'the inhospitality' shown by the Dutch to Charles during the time of his exile, which is at variance with the statements of Guizot. Gratian says that Charles II. 'left the country which had given him refuge in misfortune with profuse expressions of regard and gratitude.'—'History of the Netherlands,' p. 279.

came from the citizens in St. George's Fields, where the lord mayor and aldermen invited the royal party to partake of a collation in a tent, and everything was prepared which could add splendour to the procession which conducted the new sovereign from London Bridge to Whitehall. The streets were hung with tapestry; Charles rode between his brothers, and the lord mayor preceded with the sword of state. It was nearly seven when Charles reached the palace, where deputations from both Houses awaited him. The Lords were received in the great hall; the Commons in that 'Banqueting Room' through which, eleven years before, Charles I. had passed to the scaffold. The king observed to some of his companions, at the close of the formalities, 'It must surely have been my fault that I did not come before, for I have met with no one to-day who did not protest that he always wished for my restoration!'

The general as well as natural inclination was to servile adulation. 'Charles,' says Mrs. Hutchinson, 'found nothing but prostrates. It was a wonder in that day to see the mutability of some and the hypocrisy of others, and the servile flattery of all. Monk, like his better genius, conducted him, and was adored like one that had brought all the glory and felicity of mankind home with this prince.'

The French ambassador, writing to Cardinal Mazarin, declared that Charles II., possessing the complete affection of his subjects, and all the powers of government being placed in his hands, now stood in a very different position from that of his ancestors.¹

¹ Guizot, ii. 434.

CHAPTER XXX.

CHARLES II.

A.D. 1660—1685.

THE accession of King Charles to the throne of his ancestors was hailed with more general joy than any event recorded in the English annals. All the sad vicissitudes which had occurred to the Church or the nation were now ascribed to the downfall of the monarchy, and when, after an exile of seventeen years, Charles arrived in London, on his thirtieth birthday, escorted by troops to the number of twenty thousand, the people revelled in an intoxication of delight. The event of so great a revolution entirely without bloodshed, effected through that very army which had rebelled against his father, appeared to long-dejected Royalists 'such a restoration as was never mentioned in any history.'¹ Many, however, of those concerned in the late changes of government, viewed the king's return with trepidation, doubting whether an appetite for vengeance might not be whetted by the avidity of his followers. Satirical lines were written alluding to the king's poverty, and to the sums sent by Parliament for his relief.²

But while the greater number of discontented spirits retired from the scene, for the present, in hopes of avoiding the inquiries which they dreaded, the restored king appeared an object of greater popular affection than any of his predecessors had ever been.³

¹ 'Evelyn's Diary,' ii. 149.

² 'At length, by wonderful impulse of fate,
The people call him back to help the State;
And, what is worse, they send him money too
And clothe him all from head to foot anew.'

See Addenda to 'Pepys's Diary,' v. 221, where these lines are attributed to Andrew Marvell.

³ Macaulay, i. 167.

Such popularity afforded a grand opportunity for measures of reconciliation and mercy. As the Convention Parliament had proved its loyalty, the king's advisers, among whom were Hyde, the Lord Chancellor, Ormond, and Monk, held it more judicious not to agitate the country by a dissolution, and an Act was passed, therefore, declaring the two Houses then sitting at Westminster to constitute a Parliament.¹ That loyal assembly in acknowledgment decided that any recurrence of dissension between the crown and the people would be most effectually prevented by raising the royal revenue to the unprecedented amount of £1,200,000. But the first important debate arose upon the general pardon which the king had promised from Breda.²

A few days after his accession the king summoned all those who had sat in judgment on Charles I. to surrender within fourteen days, on pain of exception from any pardon or indemnity, either as to their lives or estates. As the threat of worse consequences in case of concealment held out the hope of mercy, many were induced to surrender, but the House of Lords contended that the proclamation only granted such persons the right to trial before a court of justice, and supported the condemnation of all who had sat in judgment on any Royalist. The House of Commons interceded in favour of Vane and Lambert, who had taken no part in passing sentence on the late king, and petitioned that if Vane were attainted his life should be spared, to which the king promised assent. Long debates took place concerning the limitations of the Bill of Indemnity, which at length, on August 16, received the royal assent. Charles considered it a sacred and indispensable duty to punish the regicides, but he assured the House of Lords that he wished to show mercy to all not immediately concerned in the murder of his father.³ However, early in July, Vane was arrested at his house at Hampstead and sent to the Tower, whence, shortly afterwards, he was removed to a solitary castle in one of the Scilly Isles, there to remain two years awaiting his trial.

Fifty-one persons were declared by Parliament excluded from the Bill of Indemnity as actually concerned in the late king's death, of whom twenty-five were dead, and nineteen beyond the sea; many more also for offences of less importance. Twenty-

¹ Lingard, xi. 194.

² Mrs. Hutchinson carefully says that the declaration 'promised, or at least intimated, liberty of conscience, remission of all offences, enjoyment of liberties and estates' (p. 309).

³ Forster's 'Life of Vane,' p. 202.

nine prisoners in custody in October, 1660, were arraigned before a court of thirty-four commissioners. The fugitives were attainted by Act of Parliament.¹ Mrs. Hutchinson mentions the treatment of those who had voluntarily surrendered; the lieutenant of the Tower 'exacting abominable rates for bare unfurnished rooms, and even stifling some persons to death for want of air.'

Colonel Hutchinson, when compelled to appear as a witness, was indignant to observe among the judges General Monk, formerly one of Cromwell's officers, and till very recently openly averse to monarchy, with Sir Ashley Cooper, who, on the eve of the Restoration, had declared that he would not suffer any man to be injured in life or property on account of his late political conduct.² The twenty-nine persons tried before this Court of High Commission were all found guilty. Ten were executed, among whom were General Harrison, Scot, who had lately defended the act of the regicides in Parliament, Axtel and Hacker, two officers who had guarded the Royal prisoner, and Hugh Peters, the fanatical preacher who had justified the execution.³ They all suffered death with fortitude, testifying to the constancy of their political opinions. But the vengeful spirit aroused among the Royalists, not satisfied with the punishment of living regicides, now, too, invaded the sacred receptacles of the dead.

The bodies of Cromwell, Bradshaw, and Ireton, previously removed from Westminster Abbey, were dragged to Tyburn, suspended on the gallows, and then buried in a deep pit.⁴ It was, however, less difficult to satisfy the vengeance of the Royalists than to allay their rapacity.

Since the year 1642 a large portion of landed property had been sold, part of which had belonged to the crown and the Church, part also to Royalists desirous to aid in carrying on the war, or to relieve the wants of the royal family. Charles had been fearful of disturbing present possessors, and declared from Breda his willingness to allow of adjustments for the just satis-

¹ Lingard, xi. 200. Three fugitives who were apprehended in Holland, suffered under the Act of Attainder in 1662. Others, who had fled to New England, or sought refuge in Switzerland, were in constant danger of apprehension.—Ib. note.

² Ashley Cooper, one of the commissioners sent to Breda, was afterwards Lord Shaftesbury.

³ It is recorded, however, to the credit of Peters, that he obtained for the unhappy monarch the spiritual assistance of Dr. Juxon, which Charles so highly valued.—Lingard, x. 263.

⁴ According to Pepys and Evelyn, this frightful act took place on January 30, the day of 'King Charles's Martyrdom.'

faction of all concerned. It was the Lord Chancellor's fixed resolution that the Church should be reinstated in its property, and in this he succeeded; but the large body of Cavaliers who had been fined 'for delinquency' by the ordinances of the Long Parliament, or whose estates had been sequestered, had no remedy for their losses when the Act of Indemnity put a stop to suits against the purchasers of their lands. It was natural for men who had in some cases pawned their jewels or reduced themselves to poverty in support of the royal cause to murmur when they beheld the vanquished Republicans undisturbed in their possessions. Rating their own disappointed hopes above the honour of their king, they called the statute 'an Act of indemnity for the king's enemies, and of oblivion for his friends,' and retained a deep hatred of Clarendon, 'whose steady adherence to the great principle of the Act' is approved by Hallam as 'the most honourable act of his public life.'¹

The army, which consisted in the three kingdoms of more than 60,000 men, was a subject of anxiety, not on account of its maintenance only, but also of the prevalence in the ranks of free opinions which made the government distrustful of its loyalty. Parliament wisely took care to settle all arrears of pay, and the regiments were gradually disbanded without exciting public discontent. Monk's own regiment and that from Dunkirk were retained under the name of the King's Guards, thus beginning the present regular army of Great Britain.²

The government, moreover, was sufficiently well-advised to adopt two financial improvements for which the country had been indebted to the revolution of 1641. The Court of Wards, which had been accustomed to detain the property of minors without accounting for the profits, was now swept away for ever, together with the royal privileges of purveyance and pre-emption, 'the fruitful theme of so many complaining Parliaments.' The Act which abolished these abuses 'may be said to have wrought an important change in the spirit of the English Constitution;' and hence, in spite of the tendency to arbitrary power, afterwards cherished by Charles and his successor, not so many illegal and oppressive acts were committed towards individuals as under the two first of the Stuart kings.³ The other measure adopted from the Long Parliament was the

¹ 'Constitutional History, ii. 79.

² *Ib.* 13; Lingard, xi. 197.

³ Hallam, ii. 11-12. See an account of the origin and abuses of this feudal court in Macaulay's 'History,' i. 153. A Bill taking 'away tenures in chivalry and wardship' was passed by the Convention Parliament just before the king's return.—Hallam, i. 717.

Excise duty, first introduced to defray the charges of the civil war, and perpetuated from present need. The financial difficulties were great. Pepys, clerk to the Admiralty, writes of a benevolence or voluntary subscription, in 1661, by which so little was gained 'that it had better never have been set up.' He describes the sailors as waiting so long for their wages that they were forced to borrow, and that the king was scarcely able to set out five ships, 'we neither having money, credit, nor stores.'¹

The peaceable arrangement of theological differences also required the greatest care on the part of the government.

The Presbyterian ministers had lately acted as zealous missionaries in aid of the king; were they then to be driven from their livings? On the other hand, the episcopal clergy claimed compensation for past injuries, and it was urged that the orthodox hierarchy, in defence of which the late king had forfeited his life, was the only sure bulwark of the monarchy. Hyde, the Chancellor, although a most zealous friend of the Church, began by moderate measures, even offering bishoprics to some eminent Presbyterians.²

The king found it expedient to publish a declaration in which he repeated his promise to grant liberty of conscience, and held out the hope of a compromise concerning the ceremonies of the Established Church, which might tend to peace. Neither the reading of the Liturgy nor subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles should be required from conscientious objectors.³ But those who were in the king's counsels were well aware of the insincerity of this declaration, which was drawn up by the Lord Chancellor. Indeed, an insignificant insurrection of some 'Fifth Monarchymen,' headed by Venner, a wine cooper, at once supplied the government, as usual in such cases, with a pretext for restraining freedom of opinion. The poverty of the state, although it troubled Pepys, the clerk of the Admiralty, made no abatement in the expense of the most splendid coronation which England had ever known.⁴

Hyde, the Lord Chancellor and principal minister, now received the title of Earl of Clarendon, under which he is so well known as a writer. A general election took place, and the enthusiasm of the nation led it to confide its property, liberty,

¹ 'Pepys's Diary,' i. 269, 338, 377.

² Hallam, ii. 19. The bishops were not restored to their seats in the House of Lords till the Parliament succeeding the Convention, p. 22.

³ Lingard, xi. 208; Macaulay, i. 174.

⁴ Macaulay, i. 175. 'Evelyn's Diary,' April 23, 1661. It was on St. George's day. £70,000 were voted for the expenses.—Lingard, xi. 213.

and religion to a body of uncompromising Cavaliers. The bishops now returned to the House of Lords, and, in the triumph of High Church principles, the Presbyterians, who had so lately prepared the way for the restoration, soon lay prostrate at their feet, and were treated as constant enemies of monarchy.¹

The temper of Parliament was speedily revealed in an order that all the members should receive the Sacrament together according to the Church of England, and that 'the Solemn League and Covenant,' that pledge to which Charles, when crowned in Scotland ten years before, had solemnly given his assent, should be publicly burnt by the common hangman. Although the Act of Indemnity had passed, limited indeed by certain exceptions, retaliation was yet to follow. Already, in November, 1660, John Bunyan, 'the most popular religious writer in the English language,' had been thrown into Bedford gaol, where, with some few intervals of liberty, he remained for nearly twelve years, and where he began to write 'The Pilgrim's Progress.'

The Marquis of Argyle had for many years upheld in Scotland the Presbyterian Church. He had been instrumental in delivering Charles I. to the English army—an act which it was scarcely possible for the present king to forgive, but he had protested against the condemnation of the sovereign. He had pursued the Marquis of Montrose to death as the leader of an adverse faction, but he had with his own hands placed the Scottish crown on the head of Charles II. in the year 1651, when the English Republicans would have brought him to the scaffold. Argyle could not but expect lenity, if not favours, at the hands of Charles, when he ventured to London in 1660. But he found himself among enemies who thirsted for vengeance on the destroyer of Montrose. Although Charles had in the hour of danger denounced Montrose himself, he was not the more inclined to favour one who had compelled him to take the Covenant; he refused to see Argyle, and was persuaded to send him back to Scotland to be tried by his implacable enemies.

An amnesty, which had been published years before in Scotland, exempted Argyle from punishment for his conduct towards the late king; the principal charges brought against him were that he had spoken ill of the royal family, had received a sum of money from Oliver Cromwell, and had voted against the recall of the Stuarts, all which charges might equally have been made against Monk. The court, although willing to condemn him, still appeared undecided, till a small packet of letters, formerly written by Argyle to Monk and other officers, were added

¹ Hallam, ii. 22; also Macaulay, iv. 334.

to other evidence. He was condemned, and his judges hastened the execution that he might not be able to appeal to the mercy of the king.¹

His enemies had the satisfaction of seeing his head fixed on the same spike upon which that of Montrose had been exhibited just eleven years before. Charles showed some compunction, or sense of justice, by rescuing Argyle's large estates from sequestration, and conferring them nearly entire on his eldest son, who inherited the title of earl. The execution of this nobleman, five days after the burning of the Covenant, was followed by that of Guthrie, one of the most violent and influential of the Scottish ministers. In vain did this earnest man seek to justify himself and urge that he had constantly opposed the government of both the Cromwells.

The French minister, Cardinal Mazarin, had cultivated the most friendly relations with Cromwell. To satisfy the Protector the young Stuart princes, although pensioned by the court of France, were induced to leave the French territory; Cromwell had also received from Louis XIV. the gift of a splendid sword. But as soon as Charles Stuart became king of England, both Louis and his powerful minister resolved to cultivate the friendship of the restored dynasty. It was by the aid of England that France had been enabled successfully to conclude the long war with Spain. The treaty thus formed with Cromwell led the way to a secret correspondence between Charles and Louis, which redounded to the dishonour of the king and was at the same time highly dangerous to the liberties of England.² Charles now announced to Parliament his intention of marrying the Princess Catherine of Portugal—a marriage which, notwithstanding the Roman Catholic persuasion of the princess, was approved by both Houses. Louis eagerly promoted this alliance, and secretly offered Charles a large sum to purchase votes in Parliament, promising to lend him £50,000 whenever he might want it, and to give a further large supply in case of a war between England and Spain.

A proffered dower of £500,000, the possession of Tangier, on the African coast, with Bombay in the East Indies, and the promise of free trade with Portugal, were conditions sufficiently advantageous to England. The royal marriage took place at Portsmouth on May 20, and the rites of the Roman Catholic

¹ 'Could he have appealed to the king, his life,' says Lingard, 'would probably have been spared' (xi. 230).

² Lingard, xi. 248–251. The French historian Michelet speaks of the extraordinary alliance of the flag of the Most Catholic State with that of the Puritan Commonwealth.

Church, which were privately performed to satisfy the princess, were followed by the benediction of the Bishop of London.

James, Duke of York, who had not yet declared himself a Roman Catholic, had secretly married Anne Hyde, the chancellor's daughter, in September, 1660. The mother of the new duchess had been of low rank, and the connection was at first much disapproved by the Queen Dowager.¹ Henrietta, the youngest sister of Charles, was also married to Philip, brother of Louis XIV., and the ceremony took place in France with great magnificence.

Royal marriages and days of coronation have been frequently the occasion of acts of mercy, but it was otherwise in 1662. During the Convention Parliament the Commons had been more moderate than the Lords, but they were now fierce against all concerned in the late revolution. Although the late House of Commons had recommended Vane and Lambert to mercy, and the king had promised to spare their lives, even that royal word was unavailing when the present House pressed for judgment. The conduct of these men presented a striking contrast. Lambert, a vain and ambitious man, who had rashly attempted to take upon himself the position of Cromwell, was now a humble and contrite suppliant for the royal mercy, and obtained such clemency that, although sentenced to death, he was sent to the island of Guernsey, where he amused himself during long years of banishment by painting and cultivating flowers.²

Vane, on the contrary—who, although an enthusiastic and inflexible Republican, had not been immediately concerned in the king's death—the friend of Milton, a man of disinterested integrity, and always opposed to sanguinary measures, still further aggravated the king's displeasure by the intrepidity of his behaviour on his trial. 'He is too dangerous a man to let live, if we can honestly put him out of the way,' wrote Charles to Clarendon. The keeper of the king's conscience did not interfere, and Vane was accordingly beheaded on June 14.³ Numerous executions took place after the real or pretended discovery of conspiracies, which were probably in some cases instigated by the zeal of the informers employed in their detection, until the king, who was not naturally cruel, declared

¹ Evelyn mentions on December 22, 1660, having kissed the hand of the new Duchess of York; 'a great change—can it succeed well?' It succeeded well for England, as the daughters of this marriage received a Protestant education, and became in turn the Queens Mary and Anne.

² Six years afterwards, Lambert was brought to the Isle of St. Nicholas, Plymouth, where he was imprisoned till his death in 1684.—Lingard, xi. 224, note.

³ Hallam, ii. 25–26, note.

that he was 'weary of hanging.' By gradual steps the orthodox party, under Lord Clarendon's powerful protection, cleared the National Church of the Presbyterians, some of whom, during the first two years of this reign, filled the metropolitan pulpits.¹

Now, in spite of the Declaration of Breda and the king's further assurances of toleration, the ruling party in the Parliament and the Church determined to insist that every clergyman must adopt the ritual in its most complete form. 'With feelings of shame the king recalled his word.'² The Act of Uniformity came into force, and 2,000 ministers resigned, or were deprived of their pulpits. Pepys notes the general commiseration expressed for 'the poor ministers that were put out,' to whom the king had been so much beholden for his coming in, adding that if such an act had been foreseen, 'he had never come in.' Dr. Calamy, one of the principal Presbyterians, who had joined the deputation to Holland before the king's accession, took leave of his people on this occasion. A few months afterwards he ventured to preach in a church as a supply, when 'otherwise the people must have gone away without ever a sermon, they being disappointed of a minister;' but this excuse did not satisfy the Bishop of London, who sent him to Newgate for the offence.³

The whole kingdom resounded with the apologies of the one party and the complaints of the other. It was urged that those at present deprived had treated the Episcopalians with equal severity. To this it was replied that the established clergy had been removed during a time of civil war in which they took part; whereas the present was a period of peace, and that the Presbyterians had been of late eminently loyal. The rulers of the Commonwealth had also granted to the deprived clergy a fifth part of their income, while no provision was now made for the sufferers, who would have starved had they not been relieved by private benevolence.

¹ Pepys notes, in 1660, the first introduction of an organ in church. In November of the same year, the clergyman of St. Olave's in London 'did begin to nibble at the Common Prayer,' to which the people had been so little accustomed that they were not aware how to make the responses. About a year afterwards he notes having seen at St. Paul's 'the choristers in their surplices going to prayers, and a few idle people and boys to hear them;' adding, 'This is the first time I have seen them.' Again, he proceeds, in October, 1662, to describe 'one at church with a surplice on,' many persons murmuring at the sight of clerical vestments which had been accounted Popish.—'Pepys's Diary,' vol. i., July 8, November 4, December 30, 1660; November 18, 1661, and October 5, 1662.

² Lingard, xi. 261; Hallam, ii. 38. The day fixed for the ejection from their livings of all ministers who refused complete assent to the Book of Common Prayer was that of St. Bartholomew, already but too memorable in relation to the French Protestants at Paris.

³ Pepys, ii. 93.

The stringency of the measure must have been offensive to the king, who was lax in his religious opinions, and had just married a Roman Catholic princess. He wished his ministers in the next session to bring in a Bill allowing him to grant acts of indulgence, and to dispense at his discretion with the lately established law. But 'both Houses were immediately in a flame.' Loyal as was the Parliament, it yet refused to grant the sovereign the power of dispensing with the law, and so great was the opposition made by the bishops to the proposed Bill that it remained unnoticed on the table.¹

Charles did not hesitate to remonstrate with the bishops on their bigotry. It was to his promise of toleration, at Breda, that they owed their restoration to power; they now employed that power in preventing him from fulfilling his promises. He warned them that in his father's reign the intolerance of the prelates had led to the destruction of their order.²

Colonel Hutchinson had been for some time in retirement, grieving with silent indignation at the hard fate of those who had surrendered in the hope of the king's clemency, and himself relieving some of those poor prisoners. In October, 1663, he was arrested at his seat at Owthorpe, in Nottinghamshire, 'upon suspicion of a plot,' or rather in the hope that he might be involved in the legal consequences of an attempt to which a few discontented people had been encouraged by spies, a mere attempt to trepan them in the name of freedom and the old Parliament.³ The colonel was closely examined respecting his employments and companions, and whether he went to church and used the ritual of the Common Prayer-book; his answer in the negative was registered as unfavourable, and considered a sign of his unchanged republican principles. He was imprisoned in that part of the Tower called 'the Bloody Tower,' on account of the many murders which had been there committed, whence he was afterwards sent to Sandown Castle, near Deal, an old ruined place without common accommodation; and there, after enduring many privations for eleven months, an attack of ague ended his life, September 11, 1664. In his wife's words, he fell a victim 'to the murderous cruelty of the men then in power.'⁴

The expense of an armament sent out for the protection of

¹ Lingard, xi. 266.

² Lingard, xi. 267.

³ See Mrs. Hutchinson's *Memoirs of her husband*. The Duke of Buckingham wrote that although it did not at first appear so, he hoped that 'he should bring Mr. Hutchinson into the plot' (p. 403.)

⁴ See Hallam, ii. 66, note. *Memoir*, p. 447.

Portugal against Spain, that of an expedition to take possession of Bombay, and the maintenance of Tangier, had swallowed up all the profits of the royal marriage. Lord Clarendon advocated the sale of Dunkirk to the King of France. The annual cost of the place to England was estimated at £130,000; it had been acquired under Cromwell, and was viewed by the nation as compensation for the loss of Calais. Charles and his ministers were aware of the unpopularity of the proceeding; they therefore resolved to obtain as high a price as possible, but appear to have been outwitted by the King of France, who gave bills for 5,000,000 livres, and negotiated his own remittances.¹

The popular indignation vented itself in strong aspersions on Charles and his minister. It was said that the king's prodigality was the real cause of the sale, for it was notorious that the charges of Dunkirk fell far short of the sums he wasted in folly and vice.² Clarendon was reported to have favoured the sale in consequence of an enormous bribe from the King of France, and, although there was no foundation for the charge, the people gave the name of *Dunkirk House* to the magnificent mansion which he had lately erected in the west of London. From this period the unpopularity of the lord chancellor increased, till it at length occasioned his downfall. In the summer of 1663, the Earl of Bristol brought charges of high treason against Lord Clarendon for his general mismanagement, his having received bribes, advised the sale of Dunkirk, and having 'endeavoured to bring in Popery.' The judges, however, declared these charges not to constitute treason; and the king, by a message, assured the House of Lords that he knew 'most of the articles brought against the lord chancellor to be false.'³ The ultimate ruin of the chancellor, after a few years, was produced by a strange combination. The Cavaliers hated him because he had kept the general promises of the Bill of Indemnity with regard to property, and had prevented them from seizing the sequestered estates. The Presbyterians, on the other hand, could not forgive the violation of the royal promise in passing the Act of Uniformity.⁴ Lord Clarendon's supposed partiality for his son-in-law, James, Duke of York, aggravated the popular dislike.

The poverty of the King of England was a subject of ridicule on the continent. A print appeared in Holland representing Charles with the pockets of his coat hanging loose, and another

¹ Guizot, 'Richard Cromwell,' i. 277; Lingard, xi. 259.

² Macaulay, i. 190.

³ 'Pepys's Diary,' July 13, 1663.

⁴ Hallam, ii. 64.

representing his pockets rifled by his courtiers.¹ The rising of a few religious enthusiasts in the North was the plea for a measure of extreme repression, by which the ruling party hoped to extinguish Dissent altogether. By this, which was called the 'Conventicle Act,' all meetings of more than five persons, besides those of a private family, for a religious service, differing from that of the Church of England, were declared unlawful, and every person who participated in such religious exercises was liable to pay a fine of five pounds, or to be imprisoned for three months; double punishment following a repetition of the offence. Roman Catholics and Dissenters suffered equally by this Act, and the gaols were soon filled with both ministers and their hearers.

The newly acquired possessions, Tangier and Bombay, which were to have filled the treasury with their contributions, did not answer expectation. The African and East Indian Companies complained of Dutch interference, and pressed for war. They found Charles by no means averse to the proposal; indeed, he desired both to revenge the caricatures and to obtain larger subsidies for the needful expenses.²

The most formidable fleet was at length sent out which had ever left England, under the command of the Duke of York, Prince Rupert, and Lord Sandwich; and on June 3, 1665, a great encounter took place between the English armament and the still larger fleet from Holland, off Lowestoft, with a victory, hitherto unprecedented, on the side of the English.

The exultation excited by this great naval victory was, however, speedily abated by the ravages of the plague in London. This fell disease drove away even the royal family, with all those who could escape from the infected city; and Parliament adjourned to Oxford. The presence of the plague was indicated on every infected house by a large red cross painted by order on the door, and the wretched inmates were frequently left to their fate. Many of the physicians even fled into the country, and the misery and desolation were extreme. In July the weekly mortality exceeded two thousand, and many of the streets were deserted, fires being kindled in the hope of purifying the air. The clergy also frequently deserted their posts at this time of heavy trial, whereupon some of those ministers who had been recently driven from their pulpits, now ventured forth to supply the churches, while the people, forgetful of distinctions in their pressing necessity, gladly flocked to hear them.³ This self-devotion, however, although allowed to pass

¹ Pepys, November 28, 1663.

² 'Pepys's Diary,' ii. 400-402.

³ See 'London and its Environs Described,' a book published in 1761.

unnoticed at the time, was rewarded by a fresh enactment called 'The Five Mile Act,' which was hurried through Parliament, and prohibited all clergy who had not subscribed the Act of Uniformity from teaching in schools, or residing within 'five miles' of any city or borough sending members to Parliament. The greater part of the Nonconformist clergy, who still refused to subscribe, were by this harsh measure banished from the towns where they had friends, and driven to country villages where they were unknown, being thus deprived at a blow both of their means of subsistence and of all the enjoyments of social life. 'No severity comparable to this cold-blooded persecution had been inflicted under the late government, even in the ferment and fury of civil war.'¹ The dread of civil dissensions thus occasioned the most bigoted exclusiveness, and the alarm caused by the dreadful ravages of the plague appears to have stifled in the authorities the natural feelings of humanity. During the fatal month of August it is related that a female servant who had taken the infection, having escaped from the out-house in which she was confined, was stopped on a common beyond London and carried back to a pest-house. Infected persons who escaped in parties were even liable to be put to death as felons, and thus numbers perished whose lives might have been saved in better air.²

The shops were not generally re-opened till January, 1666, and not till February did the court return to Whitehall. Another calamity succeeded.

In the following September a fire which began in a bake-house in a crowded part of the city, speedily increased by a violent wind, continued to spread destruction through three days and nights, occasioning general confusion and distress, and destroying St. Paul's and several other churches. The king and the Duke of York went in their barge to the eastern end of the city, and gave orders for the demolition of buildings, a prudent measure which was at last successful in staying the progress of the flames.

The destruction of the neighbouring buildings saved the Temple church, and likewise the Tower, which contained a powder-magazine. Two-thirds of the city were destroyed, and 200,000 persons were driven from their homes, many of whom took refuge in huts in the fields of Islington and Highgate.³ The cause of the fire was sufficiently clear, and the king's

¹ Hallam, ii. 49.

² See 'Pepys's Diary' iii.; and Lingard, xi. 283.

³ 'Pepys's Diary'; Evelyn, ii. 266; Lingard, xi. 301. Pepys mentions, as a proof

exertions both to stay the flames and to procure relief for the sufferers, showed the amiable side of his character to advantage. But at this time of political and religious rancour the general impulse was to cast on personal adversaries the blame of the misfortune which had befallen the city. The strict religionists believed that the king's immorality might well excite the divine displeasure; the Cavaliers recriminated against the Republicans. Indeed, after an examination before the Council and the chief justice, although without the smallest proof of the allegation, it was determined that the monument begun in 1671 should set forth the calumny that 'the burning of this city was begun and carried on by the treachery and malice of the Popish faction,' a statement which, to the disgrace of England, was only erased a few years ago.¹

A violent debate which took place this year in Parliament, concerning a Bill to prohibit the importation of meat from Ireland, exhibited the narrow prejudices then prevailing. The importation of Irish sheep and cattle had been previously prohibited, in compliance with the complaints of English farmers, and the restriction was extended to salt beef and bacon, in spite of the arguments of those who maintained that the people ought to be allowed to purchase cheap food, and that Irish farmers who could not sell their cattle must be unable to purchase English manufactures. Never, for many years, had any political question excited so much agitation either in Parliament or the country, until the king interposed in favour of the Bill.²

On the accession of Charles the ordinances of the Church of England were again enforced in Scotland, where the number of bishops was increased, and Sharp, formerly a Presbyterian, was appointed Archbishop of St. Andrew's. The exasperated feelings of the people soon led to scenes of violence. In many parts of Scotland the newly imposed clergy were received with the strongest signs of displeasure, while the people gathered round their old pastors in barns or on the moors, renewing their pledges in favour of the national Covenant and against episcopacy. The efforts made by the Scottish Parliament to put down such gatherings, and to enforce attendance at church by fines and punishments, only inflamed the general discontent, of the increasing taste for music, that hardly a boat-load of furniture was removed which did not contain 'a pair of virginals,' a kind of small spinet.

¹ Where London's column, pointing at the skies,
Like a tall bully, lifts the head and lies.'

Pope's 'Moral Essays,' epistle iii.

² Lingard, xi. 305.

and in November, 1666, a body of Presbyterians, including several enthusiastic ministers, attempted to march upon Edinburgh. Their bravery, however, had small chance of success. They were opposed by the royal army; about fifty of the insurgents were left dead on the field, and the prisoners were very numerous. The prelates did not counsel mercy, and Charles ordered a rigorous inquiry into the origin of the outbreak, in the course of which the cruel torture of 'the boot' was inflicted on several prisoners without eliciting any disclosure. Twenty were executed in Edinburgh, and about the same number elsewhere, all of whom died professing their attachment to the Covenant. The king thus at length became persuaded that persecution had provoked the revolt, and ordered that the Whigs, by which name the Covenanters were designated, should be treated with less severity.¹

Louis XIV., secretly covetous of Flanders, early in 1665, after the death of Philip of Spain, joined the Dutch against England. On June 1 a great naval battle was fought between the English and Dutch forces, called 'the Four Days' Battle,' in which the superiority was on the side of the Dutch. Monk, now Duke of Albemarle, and Prince Rupert commanded the English fleet. The letters of Evelyn, one of the commissioners for the relief of disabled seamen, contain the most dismal complaints of the sailors' wretchedness. Some were in fact perishing in the streets for want of their arrears of pay.² The difficulty of raising money for the war was much increased by the commercial losses caused by the plague and the fire; and, although men were pressed into the navy so persistently that those of humble rank dreaded to be seen in the streets, no provision had yet been made to ensure their support. 'The desperate condition that we put men into for want of their pay makes them mad,' wrote Pepys in 1667.

Two large ships were accordingly put out of commission by the government, upon which the Duke of York urged the danger that the Dutch might insult the coast, and even plunder the maritime counties. Orders were consequently issued for the construction of a fort at Sheerness, and the adoption of all possible precautions. But the commissioners had no credit; 'the sailors refused to serve, the labourers to work, the merchants to sell, without immediate payment,' and it was impossible to procure money.³

¹ Lingard, 307-309; 'Pepys's Diary,' iii. 352.

² See Evelyn's letters to Lord Cornbury and Sir William Coventry, iv. 156-168.

³ Lingard, p. 312, and Pepys, iii. 156, 162.

Early in June the alarm at the near approach of the hostile fleet caused the Duke of Albemarle to make preparations at the mouth of the Medway, notwithstanding which the Dutch fleet advanced to Chatham, and burnt three English ships, even ascending the Thames also as far as Gravesend. Van Ghent, the Dutch commander, intimidated, possibly, by the fire of the English batteries, then rejoined the other division of the fleet at the Nore. The alarm in London had been very great, and some persons hastened to remove their property into the country. Two subsequent attempts were made to ascend the Thames, but the design was abandoned; nevertheless the enemy continued for six weeks to sweep the western coasts of the country. The actual loss occasioned by this incursion was trifling, but both the monarch and his subjects keenly felt the disgrace. Charles exerted himself to address the militia upon Tower Hill, but failed to obliterate the remembrance of his careless prodigality. 'Everybody,' writes Pepys, 'do now-a-days reflect upon Oliver, and commend him, what brave things he did, and made all the neighbouring princes fear him; while here is a prince come with all the love and prayers and good liking of his people—who have given greater signs of loyalty and willingness to serve him with their estates than ever was done by any people—hath lost all so soon, that it is a miracle what way a man could devise to lose so much in so little time.'¹

Louis's ambitious designs with respect to Holland had, for some time, rendered him desirous of peace with England. A secret treaty, unknown to the ministers of either court, had been concluded by Charles and Louis some months before the arrival of the Dutch fleet. It was negotiated through the ex-queen Henrietta Maria, the aunt of the one and mother of the other; and so much as was destined for the public eye was to be afterwards embodied in a public treaty.² On July 21, treaties of peace were signed by the English commissioners with Holland, France, and Denmark.

The public discontent still ran high against Lord Clarendon, who had been the most faithful of the king's friends, and was the most celebrated of his ministers. It was justly imputed to Clarendon that Dunkirk had been sold to France. On the arrival of the Dutch fleet in the river, the rage of the

¹ Pepys, July 12, 1667. Pepys was a decided Royalist.

² Lingard, xi. 311. The knowledge of this, the first of the secret treaties between the Kings of France and England, was given to the world by Louis XIV. in works published after his death.

people was directed against the chancellor, and men of the most opposite opinions joined to decry him.

For none of the popular reasons would Charles have turned from the minister who had been his companion in poverty and exile, and whose dignified presence gave some appearance of respectability to a profligate court. But Lord Clarendon had tried the king's friendship too far by rebuking his vices, and the vindictive favourites whom he scorned became his most powerful enemies. The Duke of York pleaded strongly with the king in favour of his father-in-law, but without avail, and to many the lofty marriage of his daughter was an additional proof of Clarendon's dangerous ambition. Charles gave up his minister, and on receiving six weeks afterwards the thanks of Parliament, he assured both Houses that he had determined never more to employ Clarendon in any capacity.¹ But the animosity of the House of Commons was still unsatisfied, and seventeen charges of impeachment were drawn up by their committee, setting forth that the ex-chancellor had been guilty of both cruelty and venality, had acquired wealth by unlawful means, and had encouraged the king to be dependent on French assistance. Charles urged the fallen minister to retire to the continent. Clarendon was summoned to surrender himself to Parliament for trial before February 1, and an Act was passed subjecting him to the penalties of high treason if he returned to England. He remained very unwillingly an exile for the whole remainder of his life, which he spent chiefly in the South of France.²

Flanders, which formed a valuable part of the Spanish dominions, was, during the summer of 1667, overrun by the armies of Louis XIV. On his marriage with a Spanish princess, Louis had denied any intention of laying claim to the Spanish territories; but, on the death of Philip IV. in 1665, when an infant became the heir to that monarchy, he set all stipulations aside, and the speedy successes of the French arms excited general alarm in Europe. The Pope, indeed, from regard for Spain, and the Dutch, from apprehension for themselves, now both offered to mediate. Sir William Temple, the English Resident at Brussels, advised his government to attempt to check the progress of France by a treaty with the States-General; it was chiefly through his instrumentality that what was termed

¹ Lingard, xi. 320. Evelyn asserts more than once that the profligate favourites of the king were the principal cause of Clarendon's downfall, and that a very unfavourable change took place at court after his disgrace.

² Lord Clarendon died at Rouen in 1674, having advanced so far towards England in the hope of being allowed to return, but Charles did not interpose in his favour.—Lingard, xi. 324.

'the Triple Alliance' was concluded in April, 1668. England, Holland, and Sweden, formed a defensive league against the further prosecution of the war.

The Triple Alliance was highly popular in England, at any rate with Protestants. The Cavaliers rejoiced in a league which set a limit to the French encroachments, while the Roundheads still more rejoiced to see England join with a country republican in government and Presbyterian in religion against despotic and Catholic France.¹

There was, however, a traitor in the council-chamber, and that traitor was the King of England. Those reasons which so strongly recommended the alliance to the country were so many reasons against it with Charles. His feelings were all in favour of monarchy untrammelled by Parliament, and in case of need he expected aid from the gold of the French king. Shortly after the treaty of alliance was signed at the Hague, and Louis had been induced to make peace with Spain, Charles was apologising to the King of France for having concurred in the act which many of his subjects declared to be the best of his reign, and was expressing his desire to enter into a closer union with France. Through his sister, Henrietta, the Duchess of Orleans, who had an interview with Charles at Dover, the secret treaty between the Kings of England and France was concluded in May, 1670; but its articles remained for a long time a mystery, as all the parties observed the greatest secrecy.² There was, indeed, one declaration which Charles felt a natural reluctance to disclose. Some months before this time, his brother James, Duke of York, had acknowledged to the king that he had become a Roman Catholic and desired to avow his change of creed, on which Charles, declaring that he also had the same preference, besought the advice of his most confidential ministers whether he must still profess the Protestant faith. They advised the king to communicate the change to the King of France, and to be guided by his advice.³

In reply to this confidential communication, Louis advised Charles, for the present, to suppress the change in his religious sentiments; but it was nevertheless agreed that after the disclosure he should join with Louis in a war against the Dutch

¹ Macaulay's History, i. 203.

² In less than three weeks after Henrietta's return to the French court, she died at the early age of twenty-six.

³ Lingard, xi. 336. See a copy of the secret treaty in the same vol. 347, note 2. The initials of the king's ministry at this time formed the word *cabal*. They were Sir Thomas Clifford, Lord Arlington, the Duke of Buckingham; Ashley, afterwards Lord Shaftesbury, and the Duke of Lauderdale, thence popularly called 'The King's Cabal.'

Republic, and in case of his acquiring 'any new rights on the Spanish monarchy,' lend him aid against Spain. If the conversion of the King of England should occasion any insurrection, the King of France promised an aid in money and the support of 6,000 men, so long as their assistance might be required. For the treaty of Dover, Charles himself is answerable. He held conferences on it with the French agents, he wrote many letters with his own hand, and he confessed to the French ambassador that he was almost the only man in his kingdom who liked a French alliance.¹ The avowal of a change to Roman Catholicism to be made by the son of the king whom the Church of England had chronicled as dying a martyr for her liturgy might well occasion anxiety; and, in order to keep his own Protestant ministers in the dark, a mock negotiation was set on foot and another 'pretended treaty with France actually signed, the exact counterpart of the other, except as to religion.'²

In this same year, 1670, there was a renewal of religious agitation throughout the nation respecting the Conventicle Act. The Act passed in 1664 had been limited as an experiment to three years, during which it was hoped that every form of heterodox worship might be extinguished.³ The expiration of the term raised the hopes of the Dissenters for a short time, and moderate men strove to pass such an Act of comprehension as would have brought numerous seceders into the Established Church. But these hopes were disappointed. In the Upper House the Bill was strongly opposed by the Duke of York, and also by the Presbyterian peers; but although Charles had signed the first Bill reluctantly, was naturally too indifferent to be a persecutor, and had actually promised his protection to the Nonconformists, he was averse to risk any portion of his popularity with the dominant party, and therefore promoted the passing of this most intolerant Act.⁴ Spies and informers multiplied, private houses were searched without ceremony, and many persons were dragged to prison and fined. The ignorant fanaticism and disgusting extravagance of many religious enthusiasts have in numerous instances lessened the indignation which should fall on their persecutors. But, happily for the great cause of religious liberty, the man against whom orthodox vengeance was now prominently directed was a well-educated, well-connected gentleman, the son of Admiral Penn, who was favoured with the friendship

¹ Hallam, ii. 83.

² *Ib.*

³ Lingard, xi. 270, and note.

⁴ Hallam, ii. 86.

of the king and the Duke of York. William Penn, when a young Oxford student, had been converted to the doctrines of the Quakers, and, in spite of his father's remonstrances, had become a preacher in that sect. He had published a religious tract which offended the bishops, and had been consequently imprisoned in the Tower, a punishment which strengthened his conviction of the sinfulness of all attempts to interfere with the conscience of others. He was liberated after a severe imprisonment of seven months, owing to the intercession of the Duke of York in his favour.

Soon after the renewal of the Conventicle Act, Penn went, according to his practice, with some of his friends to worship in a meeting-house in Gracechurch Street, and found the entrance guarded by soldiers. Being thus debarred entrance, he was beginning to address the people who gathered around, when he was interrupted by constables sent by the lord mayor, who hurried him and his friend Mead to Newgate, and they were soon afterwards brought to trial at the Old Bailey. They were charged with preaching to an unlawful and riotous assembly, thereby occasioning terror to many of his Majesty's subjects. The witnesses who were brought forward alleged that between three and four hundred persons had assembled in Gracechurch Street, to whom Penn and Mead had spoken, but their words were not reported, and there had been no tumult. Penn defended himself with great spirit, arguing that the sole object of himself and his friend had been to join in the worship of God, and that they had broken no law. When the jury returned as their verdict, 'Guilty of speaking in Gracechurch Street,' the recorder passionately exclaimed that unless they brought such a verdict as the court would accept they should 'starve for it,' and desired that they should be locked up without food or fire. The next morning happened to be Sunday, and as the jury, when called in, persisted in the same verdict in spite of the harsh threats with which they were assailed, they were sent back to the 'loathsome hole' in which they were immured, the recorder declaring that 'something like the Spanish Inquisition was wanted in England.' These brave men remained without refreshment for two days, and when they pronounced the words 'Not guilty' were fined each forty marks, as were also the two gentlemen who had been under trial, on the plea that they had been guilty of contempt of court by not uncovering their heads. Admiral Penn having paid the penalty incurred by his son and Mead, they were soon

liberated, but it appears uncertain how long the jurymen were allowed to languish in prison.¹

‘This,’ says Lingard, ‘is the last instance of a fine imposed on jurors under pretence that their verdict was contrary to evidence or the direction of the judge.’ One of the jurors appealed to the Court of Common Pleas, where the chief justice decided in his favour.² The king’s assent to the Conventicle Act is said to have been the price paid for supplies from Parliament. When the Houses reassembled in the autumn, the Lord Keeper informed them of the treaties which had been made for the encouragement of commerce, and of the king’s desire to fit out a sufficient fleet to protect the coasts from insult. Not a word was breathed of the king’s underhand abrogation of the Triple Alliance, to recompense which Louis was already distributing his gold to those in the king’s confidence.

Some charges of prodigality were raised, and some hints thrown out against Popery and arbitrary power, but the sum of two millions and a half was voted. Immense preparations for war now made by the King of France gave notice to the Dutch of their approaching danger, and they began to suspect when Temple was recalled from Holland, at the end of 1671, that Charles had entered into a secret league against them. In March, France and England openly declared war against the States, and in the enumeration of the several causes of his displeasure, Charles even condescended to mention the personal insults offered by Dutch caricatures and publications. In order to raise sufficient means to carry on the war, some of the king’s ministers proposed a flagrant breach of faith. It had long been usual in England for the rich goldsmiths, who were also bankers, to advance large sums when the government required help, sums repaid with interest when the taxes came in. But it was now announced that the principal could not be paid, and that the lenders must be satisfied with the interest. This sudden shock, which caused the failure of several merchants, spread general dismay through society. ‘It did exceedingly discontent the people,’ said Evelyn, and ‘did not supply the expense of the meditated war,’ for the £1,300,000 thus placed at the disposal of the government melted away, few knew how.³

¹ Clarkson’s ‘Life of Penn,’ i. 82. A volume was lately published by ‘the Surtees Society’ containing a letter from Bishop Cosin to his secretary, declaring that, owing to the treatment of the jury, ‘the credit of the fanaticks begins much to lessen in London.’

² Lingard, xi. 341, and Clarkson’s ‘Life of Penn.’

³ See ‘Evelyn’s Diary,’ March 12, 1672. Hallam calls this act, which was termed

Hopes were held out that the losers by this transaction might be recompensed by an attack on the rich Dutch fleet expected from the Levant, but the attempt did not succeed.

The Protestant Dissenters had great reason to complain of the king. He had first violated the promises of the declaration of Breda, by passing the 'Act of Uniformity,' and had lately, in compliance with the wishes of the dominant party, passed the Conventicle Act for the second time. But now at the suggestion of Lord Ashley (shortly afterwards created Lord Shaftesbury and chancellor), Charles attempted to conciliate the Dissenters by issuing a declaration of indulgence, the act of an absolute king, although in favour of religious liberty. The royal prerogative had allowed the king occasionally to interpose and stop a criminal prosecution. It was through royal clemency that the Roman Catholics had been enabled during the reigns of the Stuarts 'to withstand the crushing severity of the law ;'¹ but it was evident that the power of setting laws aside was incompatible with constitutional monarchy, and the publication of this declaration was highly unpopular even with a large number of the Puritans, whom it benefited, because the Catholics would also be benefited by its provisions.

Soon after the war commenced, a great naval encounter took place off Southwold Bay, in which the English fleet, commanded by the Duke of York, obtained the victory over De Ruyter.

The successes of the French troops by land threatened the Republic of Holland with annihilation, and drove the people to frenzy ; it was then that the forces were put under the direction of the young Prince of Orange, and he resisted all the efforts made by the King of France and by Charles, his uncle, to seduce him from the work he had undertaken. The high spirits of the Dutch rose in defence of their country ; and, with a magnanimous sacrifice of property in favour of the Commonwealth, they opened the dykes, allowing the country seats and favourite gardens of the rich inhabitants to be covered by the waters, while the cities appeared like islands standing amidst a widespread lake. The invaders could only retreat ; the United Provinces obtained a respite.²

The Parliament, after being prorogued two years, reassembled in February, 1673. Their anti-Catholic feelings had been further excited by the second marriage of the Duke of York to Marie d'Este, daughter of the Catholic Duke of Modena, and

'the shutting up of the Exchequer,' an avowed bankruptcy. The promised interest was not paid during the reign.—Hallam, ii. 88. See also Macaulay, i. 215.

¹ Hallam, ii. 89.

² Lingard, xii. 18 ; Macaulay, i. 210.

the alarm became general when the report spread that the duke, who was the heir of the monarchy, was an apostate from the Church of England.¹

Addresses setting forth the illegality of the recently published indulgence were presented to the king by the House of Commons, and the promised supply was understood to depend upon his willingness to yield. Charles at first declared he would sooner dissolve Parliament than submit to their dictation, and the Duke of York's opinion confirmed him in his resolution. But the King of France advised him not to provoke the people, and the French ambassador insisted on the danger likely to arise from a breach between him and the Parliament. Let him yield for the moment, if circumstances should require it; he would afterwards aid the King of England with men and money. Charles yielded to this advice, immediately cancelled the declaration, and forwarded a solemn promise to Parliament that he would never act in accordance with it.

Both Houses testified their satisfaction, and bonfires assured the king of the popular exultation. But even this concession was insufficient to pacify the Commons, and they now devised an Act which, originating in the panic of the day, remained in force till the reign of George IV. It was the 'Test Act,' obliging all persons employed in offices of trust to receive the sacrament according to the form of the Church of England—an enactment not only depriving the Duke of York of his office of high admiral, but equally excluding him from other offices of state.²

As some requital for the disinterested zeal with which the Dissenters supported the Test Act, a Bill was passed to repeal in a considerable degree the persecuting laws which restrained their religious meetings.³ The war with the States had been very unpopular in England. In February, 1674, Charles announced to Parliament that he had 'concluded with Holland a speedy, honourable, and, as he trusted, a lasting peace.' War, however, was prolonged between the Dutch States and France. Louis did not resent the desertion of his royal ally, and two years afterwards another secret treaty was formed between the two sovereigns, each of whom promised, in case of need, to support the other in suppressing the rebellion of his subjects. 'Parliaments are to be feared,' so wrote the French ambassador to Louis, 'and it is a kind of miracle to see a king without arms and money resist them so long.'⁴ Charles spent much of the

¹ 'Evelyn's Diary,' ii. 380.

² Lingard, xii. 46.

³ Hallam, ii. 92.

⁴ Quoted from Dalrymple, i. 141, in the 'Life of Danby.'—See 'British Statesmen,' vol. v., pp. 238–240.

French money in endeavouring to extend his influence over Parliament. He even condescended to try the effect of his own presence there. Andrew Marvell, then a member of the House of Commons, mentions the general surprise of the Lords, of the Duke of York even, when the king first appeared in that assembly and informed the House that he inherited the long-disused privilege of attending their deliberations, promising at the same time not to interrupt the debate. The king continued this practice for some years, sometimes standing by the fire-side as spectator, and declared it 'better than a play.' But the royal presence, in Marvell's eyes 'a breach of privilege,' had not the desired effect of silencing the opposition.¹

Peace had been concluded with Holland under the administration of Lord Danby, a man of no very patriotic character, but of a rooted aversion to the French alliance. It was through Danby's intervention that in 1678 a marriage was concluded between England's recent adversary, William of Orange, and the Princess Mary, eldest daughter of the Duke of York, heiress presumptive to the English crown.

Although the first Duchess of York, daughter of Lord Clarendon, had been at the time of her death commonly reputed a Catholic, her two daughters, the Princesses Mary and Anne, were educated as Protestants. It is difficult to understand how this marriage, so important in its yet unforeseen results, could be agreeable to Charles, who, careless as he may have been as to religious differences, showed a uniform preference for the French, and dislike of the Dutch connexion. To James it must have been even revolting. The king's advisers maintained, however, that an alliance with a decidedly Protestant prince would allay the religious apprehensions of the people, and the duke's objections were disregarded.² In October, 1678, the Prince of Orange visited England, and obtained the king's permission for the immediate solemnisation of the marriage, James also assuring the council of his consent. He trusted, indeed, that it would be sufficient refutation of the frequent allegation that he was planning changes in the Church and State. The continental war, which had lasted nearly seven years, terminated about the same time in the treaty of Nimeguen; and the United Provinces, which had seemed six years before on the verge of destruction, now obtained honourable terms. William's fame was great throughout Europe, and

¹ Lingard, xii. 60; and 'Memoir of Andrew Marvell,' in H. Coleridge's 'Northern Worthies.'

² Lingard, xii. 52, 104.

the English rejoiced to see this Protestant scion of their royal house united with the successor to the crown.¹

An extreme and fanatical aversion to the established order of the English Church continued to prevail in Scotland. In the year 1668 an attempt was made upon the life of Sharp, Archbishop of St. Andrew's, who, once a Puritan, had become a persecutor, and was consequently the object of the Puritan rancour.

Mitchell, the criminal, was not discovered till six years afterwards, when he chanced to occupy a small shop in Edinburgh under the same roof with the prelate whom he had assailed. Having fallen under suspicion, Mitchell confessed, upon the promise that his life would be spared; but afterwards, dreading a severe punishment, he retracted that confession. He was imprisoned for three years, was then examined respecting the rising on the Pentland Hills, and subjected to the torture of 'the boot;' after which he was tried for the attempt on the archbishop, found guilty, and executed. This unjust execution prepared the public mind for revenge; fierce fanatics banded together, stigmatised all Papists and advocates of prelates as 'enemies of Christ,' and declared it a duty to take the lives of persecutors. It was on May 3, 1679, that a company of these enthusiasts unhappily observed the archbishop's carriage on a moor near St. Andrew's. It was drawn by six horses; inside was the archbishop himself, accompanied only by his daughter. It was in vain that both supplicated for mercy; the conspirators declared that, though without any private grievance against the prelate, they held it their duty to put him to death. They executed their purpose, and, before they separated, retired to a cottage for an interval of prayer.²

These fanatics did not attempt to save themselves by flight or disguise, but, confident of the sympathy of their party, they collected a body of Covenanters, and on June 1 fought and defeated a small detachment of cavalry commanded by the celebrated Graham of Claverhouse. But undisciplined troops, however brave and enthusiastic, can seldom stand their ground against regular soldiers, and on the 22nd the Duke of Monmouth, who commanded the king's troops in Scotland, gained a complete victory at Bothwell Bridge, where 1,200 Covenanters were taken prisoners.

Of these, 270 were transported across the Atlantic as

¹ Macaulay, i. 229; Hallam, ii. 97, and note.

² Lingard, xii. 203.

slaves, the greater number being liberated on promise of submission.¹

These occurrences in Scotland were little regarded in England, which was at that time under great excitement owing to the disclosures concerning a plot against the king's life, attributed to the Roman Catholic party. The principal agent concerned in the fabrication of what was termed 'the Popish Plot' was Titus Oates, a clergyman, previously dismissed from his benefice on account of immorality, who had once himself professed the Roman Catholic faith, and had resided at some Jesuit colleges on the continent. Oates now declared that the Pope had empowered the Jesuits to undertake the government of England, and that a plan was formed for the destruction of the king, of his principal ministers, and of numerous Protestants, to burn the shipping on the Thames, and to land a French army in Ireland. He named several Catholic noblemen as intended to fill the principal offices of government, amongst whom were Lords Arundel, Powis, Bellasis, and Stafford, and thus, eventually, brought to destruction eminent men who were entirely innocent of any evil design.

When the first sketch of this pretended scheme was laid before the king, Charles, who was not personally timid, laughed at the imposture, and desired that the rumour should be suppressed. Letters, however, were received by the confessor of the Duchess of York, which attracted much attention, and Oates solemnly pledged himself to confirm the truth of his statements before Sir Edmondsbury Godfrey, a magistrate. Coleman, secretary of the duchess, was one of the accused, and had previously tried to obtain money by political intrigues. On search being made for his papers, it was found that the greater part of them had been destroyed, but some remained which contained strongly expressed hopes of a Roman Catholic revival. Letters, addressed to Father La Chaise, confessor of Louis XIV., of which copies were found, mentioned that the King of England had become, as he might say, 'by miracle, zealous of being the instrument of so glorious a work;' the opposition would be, however, great, and all possible assistance was needed. These letters, written two years previously, although quite unconnected with the alleged conspiracy to murder the king, which Oates pretended to reveal, were held sufficient evidence of treasonable designs to justify Coleman's arrest. It was, indeed, true that the king, the Duke of York, and Louis XIV. were secretly conspir-

¹ A life-like description of these events has been embodied in the tale of 'Old Mortality,' by the genius of Sir Walter Scott.

ing to subvert the Protestant establishment, and the publication of these letters divulged the secret intrigue.’¹ It was plausibly inferred that, as the papers discovered were so suspicious, evidence of the more flagrant designs had been carefully obliterated. The ferment of the people was soon afterwards excited to frenzy when the dead body of Sir Edmondsbury Godfrey, who had received the depositions against Coleman, was found in a field near London, bearing marks of his violent death. The Protestants attributed his death to a Catholic assassin; the Catholics endeavoured to ascribe it to suicide. The father of Sir Edmondsbury had ended his own life, and it was said that after the apprehension of Coleman, who was his friend, Godfrey was observed to be much depressed. The result of the inquiry before the coroner sanctioned a verdict of suicide, but a mystery enveloped his fate, which still remains unsolved. It became unsafe to deny that Godfrey had been murdered by Roman Catholics. The body was carried home in a public procession, and was exhibited for two days as that of a Protestant martyr, whilst the popular hatred of Papists was wound up to the highest pitch. Fearful of a second gunpowder plot, Parliament desired that a guard should be placed in the vaults beneath the Houses.’²

The contemporary writer, Evelyn, describes Oates as a bold man, and ‘furiously indiscreet,’ but admits that his statements were believed by every one, and entirely changed the genius and motions of the Parliament. In fact, this assembly was growing corrupt and interested from age, and the plot ‘turned them all as one man against Popery.’³ Godfrey’s funeral was attended by seventy-two clergymen wearing their gowns, and by more than 1,000 gentlemen in mourning.

In a short time the London prisons contained 2,000 suspected traitors; the military were kept all night under arms, and the guards were doubled at the palace. Charles attempted in vain to lessen the general excitement. Oates, when examined before the House of Commons, made additional disclosures, and announced the names of those whom the Pope had selected for his principal agents. The Earl of Powis, and Lords Stafford, Petre, Arundel, and Bellasis, were consequently sent to the Tower. Coleman was found guilty and executed, and so were likewise several apparently innocent men of little note. The state trials were conducted with the grossest partiality, and the judges assumed the truth of the most incredible charges

¹ Hallam, ii. 120.

² Hallam, ii. 122; Lingard, xii. 143.

³ ‘Evelyn’s Diary,’ October 1 and 21, 1678.

against the accused. At last, however, when Oates ventured to implicate the queen, it was thought necessary to discredit his testimony.¹ The Duke of York was not charged with complicity in the pretended Popish plot, but Coleman's papers had involved him in designs for the alteration of religion, upon which the popular leaders voted an address, praying for his exclusion from the king's council. The duke yielded at the king's request, and announced in the House of Lords that he was no longer a member of that body. The satisfaction with which his secession was regarded was completed by an Act excluding Roman Catholic peers from the House of Lords. Members of that communion had been excluded since the reign of Elizabeth from the House of Commons, through the Act of Supremacy, but Roman Catholic peers were now, for the first time, prohibited from sitting in the House of Lords.²

The prosecution of the accused was for a time interrupted by proceedings in Parliament against Lord Danby, the lord treasurer, which notably exposed the king's unconstitutional transactions with the French court. It appeared that Danby had, at the express command of Charles, written to Montague, the English ambassador at Paris, to obtain for the king a pension of 6,000,000 livres, in requital of his services in promoting peace, and in reply the proviso had been appended that the English Parliament should remain prorogued for another six months. Although, owing to a political change in France, the affair was still pending, the letter remained in Montague's hands, and the popular leaders resolved to make it the ground of Danby's impeachment.

These papers appeared to the House a continuation of Coleman's intrigue; they proved that the king's seeming ardour for war had been a mere pretext to wring money out of his people, and that for a further supply he was ready even to traffic with English freedom. A majority in the House of Commons voted for Danby's impeachment, but the Lords decided that no charge of high treason could be maintained.³

In 1673, Lord Shaftesbury was dismissed from the office of chancellor, and when he declared, at the beginning of 1677, that by the long prorogation Parliament was actually dissolved, he was sentenced either to kneel at the bar to beg pardon of the

¹ Hallam, ii. 124, note.

² Macaulay, i. 235; Lingard, xii. 150-151.

³ Lingard, xii. 168-171. A Bill involving less severe penalties was afterwards substituted, and Danby was sent to the Tower, where he remained five years. His attempt to screen himself by pleading a pardon obtained from the king was declared illegal.—Hallam, ii. 111 and 117; Lingard, xii. 343.

king, or to be committed to the Tower. He chose to undergo imprisonment, which lasted above a year, when he at length submitted. He attributed his persecution to the Duke of York, and availed himself of Oates's testimony and the popular excitement to strengthen the rage of the people against the Roman Catholics, and to bring forward the Exclusion Bill, allying himself with the Duke of Monmouth as the popular candidate for the throne.

When the Parliament, which, although frequently prorogued, had existed since 1661, was dissolved in January, 1679, the agitation throughout England was intense, and the stream of popular feeling ran high against the government. The most preposterous rumours were credited in connexion with 'the Plot,' and the success of Oates, who was for the season raised to power and opulence, brought forward other shameless candidates for notoriety to swear away the lives of honest men.

The rancour of the nation was so fierce against the Duke of York that Charles reluctantly advised his brother to withdraw from England for a while, and James, after requesting the king to express his wish in writing, agreed to do so when Charles had solemnly promised not to sacrifice the duke's reversionary right to the crown in favour of his own illegitimate son, the Duke of Monmouth. The favours which Charles had bestowed on this young duke, whom he had not hesitated to acknowledge, had, indeed, for some years awakened the anxiety of the Duke of York. A report prevailed, which a great part of the nation wished to believe, that Monmouth's mother, Lucy Walters, had been married to the king during his sojourn abroad, and therefore that no 'bar sinister' need prevent the succession of the handsome and popular young man whom many loved to designate as 'the Protestant duke.' But Charles solemnly declared that he had never married any one but the present queen. He made Monmouth a Knight of the Garter, placed him at the head of the army in some campaigns, and made him also Chancellor of the University of Cambridge. The duke married, at a very early age, Anne Scott, the rich heiress of the dukedom of Buccleuch, but the king never sanctioned his pretensions to the royal inheritance, and the fatal 'bar sinister' appeared on his coat of arms. Handsome and affable, a gallant soldier, yet condescending to mix with country people in their sports, Monmouth became for a time the most popular man in the kingdom, whilst the Duke of York was pursued by the hatred of all Protestants.¹

¹ Macaulay, i. 250-252.

The new Parliament, which assembled in the spring of 1679, insisted again on the reality of a horrible conspiracy formed by the Catholics for the destruction of the king and the constitution, and the subversion of the Protestant faith. Even the few who doubted or disbelieved the existence of 'the Popish Plot' declared that it was necessary to act as if it were true. Informers multiplied, and a general persecution of Roman Catholics consequently ensued. Even artisans and labourers who professed the faith of Rome were summoned to take the oaths or to give security for their behaviour, while priests were liable to be brought to trial on the charge of high treason.¹

The great subject which now employed the mind of the House of Commons was the Exclusion Bill, a proposal that, in case of the king's death, the next Protestant in succession should inherit the crown, and that if the Duke of York, who was then abroad, should ever return to England, he should be attainted of high treason, and that anyone venturing to pronounce him the rightful heir should be also involved in the same penalties. The duke's partisans argued that in case the English Parliament should carry the exclusion, their act would not deprive James of the crown of Scotland, and that a civil war, perilous both to Protestantism and to liberty, would be the inevitable result.

Charles had attempted to conciliate parties by proposing that, in case of his having a Catholic successor, all presentations to Church livings should be placed in the hands of Protestant trustees, and that, if at the time of change no Parliament were sitting, the last Parliament should be recalled. These concessions were, however, far from giving satisfaction to the popular party, and on May 27 the king unexpectedly interfered by proroguing Parliament for ten weeks.² The day of that prorogation, a time of party conflict and discontent, is yet a great era in English history, for on that day the Act which completed and perfected the existing statute of Habeas Corpus received the royal assent. Arbitrary imprisonment, which had been always contrary to the spirit of the English constitution, was rendered for ever illegal, for this Act required that all prisoners should be either brought to trial speedily or be discharged, and made it illegal to send them out of the country. Lord Clarendon had been accused of being concerned in illegal imprisonments, and prisoners had been induced to bribe the courtiers in order to gain their liberty. Those, however, who were under prosecution, or imprisoned at the time when this

¹ Lingard, xii. 181.

² Lingard, xii. 196.

Act was passed, received no benefit, as it only referred to future commitments.¹

In France, before the Revolution of 1790, the caprice of a minister, or the fancy of a royal favourite, frequently occasioned imprisonment for life; and similar despotism might have extended over England but for the wise intervention of Parliament, directed in this instance by Lord Shaftesbury, an able, although violent and frequently reprehensible, statesman.² Numerous acts of violence and several cruel executions took place at this period. Several priests suffered death, but Sir George Wakeman, the queen's physician, and three Benedictine monks, who were accused on the depositions of Oates and of another informer named Bedloe, were acquitted, which impaired the credit of these witnesses.

The Duke of York continually solicited his recall, but was warned that his presence in England might lead to an insurrection. At the close of the year 1679 he was permitted to remove from Brussels to Edinburgh, where he was well received.

The result of the late elections proved unfavourable to the court, and Charles dreaded the triumph of the supporters of the Exclusion Bill. It would have been impossible for him to dispense with the supplies which Parliament alone could legally provide, had not the King of France been ready to allow him during three years a pension of 1,000,000 livres. Thus provided, the king ordered the new Parliament to be immediately prorogued for a few weeks. The members gazed on each other with astonishment, and some would have spoken, but Charles commanded silence, and Parliament continued prorogued for a full year.³ Political feeling now agitated every part of the nation; petitions for the speedy meeting of Parliament were sent up from all quarters, and when the king issued a proclamation to discourage such manifestations, counter addresses were sent up by grand juries and loyal corporations to signify their entire confidence in their sovereign's

¹ Lingard, xii. 196; Macaulay, i. 248. The king would gladly have refused his consent to this measure, but did not venture to reject so popular a Bill. The arbitrary proceedings of Lord Clarendon had shown the necessity for a new enactment to guard against abuses.—Hallam, ii. 177.

² The king, by the advice of Sir William Temple, called some of the popular leaders to his Council in 1679, and Lord Shaftesbury, who was made President of the Council, was mainly instrumental in passing the Habeas Corpus Act. When Charles afterwards prorogued Parliament by his own act alone, Lords Shaftesbury and Russell resigned their places in the Council.—King's 'Life of Locke,' p. 137.

³ Lingard, xii. 218.

wisdom and their *abhorrence* of the petitioners. The two parties became known as *Petitioners* and *Abhorrrers*; the term *Abhorrrers*, which was first used in one address, becoming for a short time the watchword of a whole party. And now the two great ranks of 'Whig' and 'Tory,' known by long-lasting names, first opposed each other. The cardinal maxim of Toryism was the unlimited nature of the royal prerogative, unchecked by Parliament; while the Whigs insisted on Parliamentary control. The middle and lower orders, particularly in the towns, were clamorous against the Duke of York and those advisers who encouraged the king in despotic acts. But to country gentlemen, Popery was scarcely more odious than fanaticism, and in the attacks on the established principle of the succession to the crown they saw some resemblance to the violence which had so lately overturned a part of the constitution.¹

The king, in spite of his faults, still retained the good-will of a great part of the nation, and the deep interest which he was known to take in upholding his brother's rights made the conduct of those Whigs who advocated the Exclusion Bill appear harsh and disloyal. Nor was there any stability in Monmouth on which the hopes of the nation could safely rest; sober-minded men were scandalised by the kind of triumphal procession which that young duke was induced to make through several towns, exhibiting himself at fairs and races.²

When Parliament at length met on October 26, 1680, an attempt was made to substantiate new charges against the Duke of York by the evidence of Dangerfield, a discredited informer, whose testimony could only have been acceptable to men already influenced by party hatred.

Lord Russell moved that the House should take measures 'to suppress Popery, and prevent a Popish successor.' All acts of arbitrary power, and even an accidental disaster like the great fire of London, were ascribed to the Roman Catholics; and the House speedily agreed to the introduction of a Bill to disable the Duke of York from succeeding to the English throne. It was indeed a great crisis when Lord Russell, on November 15, brought up the Exclusion Bill to the Lords, accompanied by a great part of the Commons, who stayed to

¹ Hallam, ii. 139-140. These words, 'Whig' and 'Tory,' were applied in a sense very far from that in which they at first originated. The name 'Whig,' first given to the Scottish Covenanters, was now transferred to the opponents of the government. The outlaws of Ireland, who plundered the English settlers, had been first called Tories.

² Lingard, xii. 234.

hear the debate, cheered by the spectators behind the bar. The king, who had openly solicited the votes of the peers in his brother's favour, was present, and Monmouth, whom both delicacy and prudence should have silenced, warmly supported the Bill. The debate was long and at times furious, the advocates of the Bill being well aware of their personal danger if it failed. But the arts and intrigues which had been employed in support of this extreme measure, and the ambition of Monmouth, were laid bare by Lord Halifax with great ability and eloquence, and the Bill was thrown out by a large majority of the peers, including the bishops.¹

The king and the House of Lords, although triumphant in the rejection of this Bill, did not interfere for the protection of the aged nobleman who was immediately afterwards brought to trial, the most illustrious victim of that pretended Popish plot against the king's life. On November 30, Lord Stafford, one of the Catholic peers, who had been two years in confinement, was brought to trial in Westminster Hall. The lord chancellor presided as lord high steward, rows of benches were assigned to the members of the House of Commons, and separate boxes to the king and queen. The order of the court was similar to that adopted forty years before in the trial of Lord Strafford, and the same lawyer, Maynard, who was then engaged, was employed in this prosecution.

The trial lasted seven days. The bigotry which then imputed the most atrocious designs to Catholics, supported, but unsubstantiated, by witnesses 'whose characters were a sufficient condemnation of the cause which they appeared to support,' now excites nothing but repugnance in any party.²

Evelyn, who was a spectator and much impressed by the 'stately and august appearance' of the trial, yet relates that he could 'hardly think that a person of this nobleman's age and experience would engage men, whom he never saw before, *point-blanc* to murder the king,' the crime of which Lord Stafford was accused. The majority of the peers must either have believed the accusations, or been induced to sacrifice an innocent nobleman to escape the popular hatred, and the judges most subservient to the court formed part of that majority and swelled the popular cry. The Lord Chancellor Nottingham, the Duke of Lauderdale, and other members of the administration, were among those who condemned Lord Stafford.

¹ Lingard, xii. 243, 244; Macaulay, i. 258.

² Lingard, xii. 249; see also 'Evelyn's Diary,' iii. 46.

The clergy had not scrupled to increase the rancour against Papists by imputing to them the fire of London and the destruction of the fleet at Chatham, and these absurd charges were repeated in this prosecution.

When, according to the solemn usage, each peer was required in turn to pass judgment 'upon his honour,' fifty-five out of the eighty-six present pronounced the earl guilty, four of his own kindred being of the number.

The only favour shown by the king was to order that the execution should be simply beheading. When Lord Stafford mounted the scaffold on December 29, and with a firm voice assured the people of his innocence, the spectators heard him with sorrowful respect, and some expressed their belief in the truth of his declaration. 'It might easily have been predicted,' says Lord Macaulay, 'that there would soon be retaliation for the blood of Stafford.'¹ Of the other Catholic lords under arrest, Lord Petre died in prison; Lords Arundel, Powis, and Bellasis were liberated in February, 1684.

At the beginning of 1681, the House of Commons renewed its endeavours to exclude the Duke of York from the succession, and to cast odium on those by whom the Exclusion Bill had been defeated. Attempts were also made to re-establish the Duke of Monmouth in those offices of which he had been deprived by the duke's influence. To parry their attacks, Charles suddenly dissolved Parliament, summoning a fresh one to meet in two months' time at Oxford, where the royal influence was strong, and the popular leaders would be without the support which they received from the citizens of London. The greatest opposition was made on the part of the Liberals to this proposed change, and a petition against it, remarkable for the boldness of its language, was signed by sixteen peers.² So great was the strength of the party which advocated the Exclusion Bill, that Charles confessed to his advisers that if his brother would not conform and go to church, he feared it would not long remain in his power to protect him.³ All the duke's friends, at the king's command, strove to induce him to change, or, at any rate, to dissemble his religion; but James was inflexible. Rather than renounce the Catholic faith, or give up his succession to the throne, he would, with the aid of the Scottish Episcopalians and the English Catholics, have lighted the flames of another civil war.

Hostilities, indeed, appeared approaching, when, on March 14, Charles proceeded to Oxford escorted by a troop of life

¹ Macaulay's History, i. 260; Hallam, ii. 125.

² Lingard, xii. 270.

³ Hallam, ii. 131-132; Lingard, xii. 281.

guards, followed shortly afterwards by the Earl of Shaftesbury, the city members, and other popular chiefs, also armed, and with an armed escort wearing round their hats a ribbon inscribed 'No Popery, no Slavery.' Charles addressed the new Parliament in terms of complaint against the pretensions raised by the former assembly, and desired its consideration of an 'expedient' as substitute for the Exclusion Bill. This, to all appearance, granted the substance of their demands, declared that James, Duke of York, should be banished for life 500 miles from the British dominions, and that, although on the death of the present king the regal title should be his, the regency, with the powers of government, should be given to the Princess of Orange, and after her death to the Lady Anne, so continuing during the minority of any legitimate son of James who might be educated in the Protestant faith.

It was also proposed that all Catholics of considerable property should be banished the realm. It is scarcely possible that Charles was sincere in proposing terms so utterly revolting to his brother.¹ A pamphlet having just been published called 'The True Englishman Speaking Plain English,' which charged the king himself with being the accomplice of the Duke of York, a dispute arose in Parliament concerning the examination and trial of the writers. After a debate of two days, the House of Commons rejected 'the expedient,' and resolved to bring in once more the Exclusion Bill.

The chiefs of the popular party had believed the king too poor to dispense with their aid in behalf of his finances. But Charles had fortified himself with the aid of Louis XIV. Unknown to any except his confidential minister, Hyde, the son of Lord Clarendon, the king had, on the same day that he proceeded to Oxford, agreed to a secret treaty with the King of France. By this unsigned understanding, 'the terms of which were not reduced to writing,' Louis agreed to pay to Charles a subsidy for the present year of 2,000,000 livres, and for the two following of 500,000 crowns each, Charles agreeing to withdraw from the alliance with Spain.²

Confident in approaching triumph, the Commons had agreed

¹ Hallam, ii. 135.

² Lingard, xii. 272. 'No man was privy to it but Charles and Hyde on the one part, and Louis and Barillon on the other.' The English minister was Lawrence Hyde, second son of Lord Chancellor Clarendon, and brother of the first Duchess of York. See character of Hyde, afterwards Earl of Rochester, given by Lord Macaulay, i. 253-275. Lingard speaks of four secret treaties made by Charles with France, under dates of April, 1667; January, 1669, 1676, and 1681. See Lingard, xi. 311, note; ib. 337; xii. 88 and 271.

to the second reading of the Exclusion Bill, when they were unexpectedly summoned to the House of Lords, where the king, seated on the throne, commanded the chancellor to dissolve the Parliament, on the plea of the dissension between the Houses. The rage of Shaftesbury and the other popular leaders was extreme. Charles entered his carriage, was met on the road by a party of his guards, and proceeded to Windsor with a rapidity which resembled flight from an apprehended danger. He published a declaration of the reasons by which he had been induced to dissolve the two last Parliaments, to be read in all the churches. Aware that he might be accused of favouring the Catholics by the dissolution, Charles expressed in council his desire that the laws should be rigorously executed against Papists—an announcement at which Archbishop Sancroft declared his great satisfaction, and which was not allowed to remain without fatal consequences. Plunket, the Catholic Bishop of Armagh, who had been accused of assisting to prepare the way for a French invasion of Ireland, was tried in England, and convicted before the arrival of the witnesses who would have proved his innocence. When Charles was solicited to pardon him by the Earl of Essex, the late lord lieutenant, who declared that he knew him to be innocent, the king replied that he *dared not do so*; and Plunket suffered, the last of the victims sacrificed to the pretended Popish plot.¹

The same arts which had been employed to prop up the forgeries of Oates were now turned by the court party against their opponents, and on October 19 depositions were made against the Earl of Shaftesbury by three Irish witnesses, who accused the earl of having suborned them to give false testimony against the queen, the Duke of York, and others.

Shaftesbury is said to have offered to retire into exile if the prosecution were withdrawn, but the king refused to make terms. The sheriffs who were concerned in the trial were violent opponents of the court, and the people of London were strongly on the side of the earl. He was charged with having made military preparations to compel the king to yield to the Parliament at Oxford. Although, probably, the jury had determined to disbelieve the accusations brought against him, 'twelve impartial men,' says Lingard, 'would have come to the same conclusion.'

¹ Lingard, xii. 287; Hallam, ii. 148. He is there called 'the titular Archbishop of Dublin,' but Peter Talbot, who bore that title, was another victim to state cruelty, dying in the same year in prison. He had formerly rendered services to both Charles and James during their exile, but Charles *dared* not show him any favour.—Lingard, p. 285, note.

² 'Those perjured witnesses,' says Hallam, 'whom Shaftesbury had hallooed on

The Bill was ignored; the hall shook with applause; and the day was closed with all the popular signs of rejoicing, and with shouts for a Monmouth, a Shaftesbury, and a Buckingham. But this triumph was of short duration, for the publication of two papers found in Shaftesbury's possession, although not in his writing, excited widespread indignation. One of those papers contained a list of the principal persons in every county, with addition to the name of each of the words 'worthy man,' or 'man worthy'—which words were interpreted to denote *worthy of trust*, or *worthy to be hanged*, and the greatest alarm was naturally felt by those whose names were in the latter list. No further measures were taken against Lord Shaftesbury; but he is said to have been engaged in secret designs against the government, until, at the close of the year 1682, he took refuge in Holland, where he did not long survive.

His acquittal was the last popular triumph, after which the reaction in the king's favour was extraordinary. The clergy 'seemed to change the war against liberty into a crusade.' They re-echoed from every pulpit the duty of passive obedience, and enlarged on the divine origin of monarchy.¹ Among the numerous addresses drawn up in terms of abject servility which were presented to the king, that of the Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge was prominent, declaring that kings are accountable to God alone, and that 'no law, no fault, no forfeiture can alter or diminish their hereditary right.'² At the request of the magistrates of Middlesex, the severe laws against Dissenters were again enforced.

Although the ardour of the Scottish Covenanters had been discouraged by their severe losses in the battle of Bothwell Bridge in 1679, the enthusiastic party which bore the name of Cameronians still defied the authority of government. Men standing upon the scaffold for execution refused to save their lives by the simple prayer for a blessing upon the king, although on these terms the Duke of York, then administering the government, offered them immediate pardon.

The Scottish Privy Council retained the use of torture, and the duke was present, at least on one occasion, when it was applied.³ He had other objects, however, besides crushing these unfortunate zealots. He was bent on obtaining from the Scot-

through all the infamy of the Popish plot, were now arrayed in the same court to swear treason and conspiracy against him' (ii. 145).

¹ Hallam, ii. 148.

² Lingard, xii. 282, note.

³ Macaulay, i. 271. Lingard endeavours to defend the duke from the charge of cruelty (p. 298, note).

tish Parliament a recognition of his claim to the throne of Scotland on the death of the king. Hence, although well known to be a Roman Catholic, he allowed an Act to be passed to exclude all Papists and Dissenters from government offices, with the notable exception of the lawful brother or sons of the king. An Act was passed declaring it treason to attempt to alter the succession, and a new religious test was imposed forbidding any design of altering the established Presbyterian Church and monarchical government. It was expected that this test would be repugnant to the Earl of Argyle, who had many enemies in Scotland, but the earl subscribed it with an explanation that he meant to exercise in a lawful way his power of introducing beneficial changes. With this the Duke of York appeared satisfied, but, with singular baseness, allowed the earl's enemies to frame, on the ground of his reservation, charges of sedition and treason, on which a jury, guided by his hereditary enemy, the Marquis of Montrose, condemned him to death.

When Charles received the news of this verdict, he stayed the execution of the sentence, and the charges were so insufficient that the partisans of the Stuarts afterwards maintained that the prosecution was merely instituted in order to frighten Argyle into a surrender of his vast Highland territory. The earl was so fortunate as to escape from prison in disguise, and after taking shelter for a time in England, found an asylum in Holland, whence he continued to correspond with his friends in Great Britain.¹

In May, 1682, the Duke of York returned to London, and was received by the Tories with exultation.

The chiefs of the Liberal party being now deprived of all legal means of expressing their sentiments, caballed in secret; and the English malcontents held communication with the discontented Presbyterians of Scotland. Meanwhile, during the following winter the Duke of Monmouth made another progress through the North of England to ascertain the popular sentiment, and received an enthusiastic welcome. In some places he was met by gentlemen at the head of their tenantry, and the people set up cries of 'Monmouth and no York.'

The king and his council were alarmed, and issued a warrant for the duke's apprehension on the ground of expected disturbances. Monmouth was arrested at Stafford and brought to London, but was admitted to bail. The hostility which the city of London, as well as several other great towns, had lately shown to the government, and especially the failure of

¹ Macaulay, i. 538; Lingard, xii. 303-305.

the prosecution of Lord Shaftesbury, induced the king to make the most dangerous attack on public liberty which he had yet ventured to propose. It was suggested that, could a plea be found for depriving the metropolis of its charter, not only would that 'citadel of insolent rebels' be demolished, but the rest of England also would be intimidated by so striking an example.¹ There was, indeed, no precedent for the forfeiture of corporate privileges, except the conduct of Henry VIII. towards the abbeys.

It was alleged against the corporation that they had by a private ordinance imposed tolls on goods brought into the London markets, and that in 1679 the boldness of their language in the petition for the assembling of Parliament, as well as the circulation of that obnoxious paper, were violations of the law. Thus, on the most frivolous pretexts, the city of London was deprived of the free constitution which it had enjoyed for ages. The incorporated municipalities had in England, from the earliest times, assumed a large share in the government of the kingdom, and, as early as the reign of Henry III., had sent their representatives to the House of Commons. So long as the corporations remained true to the cause of liberty, there was little chance of a Parliament being chosen which would be subservient to a Stuart king.²

Evelyn, although a loyal subject, could not repress his astonishment on witnessing the reception allotted to the lord mayor and aldermen on their presenting a petition to the king. After long detention in the presence chamber, they were summoned to hear an address from the lord chancellor strongly condemnatory of their past conduct, and were told that his Majesty would not in future allow the election of a mayor or other civil functionary unless with his approval. 'And so,' says Evelyn, 'they tamely parted with their ancient privileges. What the consequences will prove, time will show. Divers of the most learned lawyers were of opinion that they could not forfeit their charter, but might be personally punished; but the plurality of the younger judges judged it otherwise.'

There appears to be scarcely any question so difficult to decide as the time at which it becomes a duty to violate the established order of a state in defence of its liberties. Lord William Russell, the eldest son of the Earl of Bedford, had

¹ See the account of the political influence of London in the seventeenth century. —Lord Macaulay, i. 354.

² Hallam, ii. 149. See Sir James Stephen's 'Lectures on France,' i. 179, contrasting the two countries, and Lord Campbell's 'Life of Lord Chancellor Guildford.'

taken a prominent part in promoting the Exclusion Bill. He had refused to join in Lord Shaftesbury's violent designs, but he and the Duke of Monmouth, the Earl of Essex, Lord Grey, Algernon Sidney, and others, were known to hold frequent conferences on the state of public affairs.¹ Meantime a plot was discovered by the government, the concoction of a military adventurer named Walcot, who had served under Cromwell, and others, for seizing the king and the Duke of York on their return from Newmarket. From the appointed place, a lonely farm belonging to one of the conspirators, called the Rye House, near Hoddesdon, on the road by which the royal brothers usually travelled, this has been termed the Rye House Plot.

Some men who were afterwards arrested hoped to obtain pardon by the importance of their disclosures; and Lords Russell Howard, and Essex were arrested and sent to the Tower, as was also Algernon Sidney.

The trial of Lord Russell commenced on July 13. The only evidence which could criminate him was that of Lord Howard, who deposed that Lord Russell had twice joined in consultation with himself, Monmouth, Essex, Grey, Sidney, and Hampden, at first to consider of the proper time for an insurrection, afterwards to decide upon sending an agent to form an alliance with the Scots. Whether the designs of the lower conspirators really amounted to a plan for the assassination of the king has been held uncertain—from that guilt all the best writers have agreed in exonerating Lord Russell—but the suicide of Lord Essex in the Tower, an act of despair which was made known in court on the day of trial, is said to have prejudiced both the bench and the jury against the accused, and he was found guilty and sentenced to death. Lady Rachel Russell, who, with admirable self-command, acted throughout the trial as her husband's secretary, obtained with some difficulty his consent to petition the king and the Duke of York for pardon.

In these petitions Lord Russell declared that he had never harboured a thought against the king's life, but he acknowledged that, through ignorance or inadvertence, he had been present at unlawful meetings. Both petitions were disregarded, and on July 21 Lord Russell met his fate with a fortitude which still further endeared his memory to the nation.

¹ Lord Macaulay expresses his belief that the leaders of the Whig party designed to raise the nation in arms against the government, although 'they were still restrained by fears or scruples from taking any decisive step' (i. 267).

‘Every one,’ says Evelyn, ‘deplores Essex and Russell, especially the last. The speech he made, and the paper which he gave the sheriff declaring his innocence, the nobleness of the family, the piety and worthiness of the unhappy gentleman, wrought much pity and occasioned various discourses on the plot.’¹ Had it not been for ‘the unhappy detection of the conspiracy,’ says Hallam, ‘and the perfidy of Lord Howard, these two noble persons’ (Essex and Russell), ‘whose lives were untimely lost to their country, might have survived to join the banner and support the throne of William.’² In the first year of that sovereign’s reign an Act was passed annulling Lord Russell’s attainder, and declaring him wrongfully convicted.

On July 21, 1683, the University of Oxford distinguished itself by passing that famous decree which condemned as impious and heretical those principles which are the foundation of free government, and directed that in future all tutors and catechists should instruct their pupils in ‘that most necessary doctrine,’ ‘Passive Obedience,’ ‘the characteristic badge of the Church of England.’³ Every new measure was now a fresh encroachment on the liberty of the people. Chief Justice Pemberton, ‘held to be the most learned of the judges and an honest man,’ was displaced, and Sir George Jeffreys, the most ignorant but most daring man on the bench, was appointed chief justice. This man accordingly presided at the trial of Algernon Sidney, son of the late Earl of Leicester, accused of being a confederate in the Rye House Plot.

Algernon Sidney had been engaged in the civil war and was one of the king’s judges, although he did not sign the warrant for his execution. Ardently attached throughout his life to Republican theories, he was averse to Cromwell’s government, and preserved through all the subsequent changes his attachment to what was called by Commonwealth men ‘the good old cause.’ It was plain that such a man would be eagerly condemned on any plausible pretext. Some sheets of MS., written apparently even before the sovereign’s accession and discovered in Sidney’s study, were held by the judge, when taken in connection with Lord Howard’s testimony, equivalent to the two witnesses required to establish treasonable designs. Even Royalists admitted that Sidney ‘had hard measure.’⁴ His name has been associated with that of

¹ Evelyn’s ‘Diary,’ July 13 and 21, 1683.

² Hallam, ii. 153. Lady Russell survived till the year 1723.

³ Lingard, xii. 326; Hallam, ii. 163. This decree was publicly burned, in 1709, by an order of the House of Lords.

⁴ Evelyn, iii. 105; Hallam, ii. 155.

Russell in the grateful veneration of posterity, and his undaunted and noble bearing and eloquent defence still further impressed the spectators at his trial and at his subsequent execution, which took place on December 7. The Duke of Monmouth having expressed contrition for the part which he had taken in various illegal designs, received the king's pardon, but by his vacillating conduct again incurred Charles's displeasure, and shortly afterwards took refuge in Holland. Hampden, the grandson of the patriot, accused of being a confederate, underwent a long trial, and, being found guilty, was condemned to pay a fine of £40,000, which, under his circumstances, amounted to a sentence of perpetual imprisonment.

Evelyn, who noted the humiliation of the corporation of London on June 18, was again present on October 4, and beheld their abasement. The recorder had been displaced, and was succeeded by an obscure lawyer. Eight aldermen had been removed, and those remaining were 'only justices of the peace, no more wearing gowns or chains of gold.' 'Thus in a moment,' said he, 'fell the pomp and grandeur of the most august city of the world, which gave great occasion of discourse what all this would end in.'¹ From this time the city remained in strict subservience to the court, until, just before the invasion of the Prince of Orange, an effort was made to restore the charter.² After the humiliation of London it was easy for the government to obtain by threats or promises the surrender of privileges belonging to smaller towns. The judges of assize lent their aid to promote this encroachment of the crown, and Jeffreys bearing the king's ring, on the northern circuit in 1684, in the words of a Royalist, made 'all the charters fall down before him, and returned laden with surrenders, the spoils of towns.' John Locke, the celebrated philosopher, was, at this period, residing quietly at Oxford University. He had been on friendly terms with the late Earl of Shaftesbury, and was reputed the author of a pamphlet which appeared during the strife concerning the Exclusion Bill, attacking 'the divine right of kings and priests.' The government upon this suddenly required the Bishop of Oxford, dean of Christ Church, no longer to allow Mr. Locke to remain a student. To this

¹ 'Evelyn's Diary,' October 4, 1683.

² Lord Campbell's 'Life of Chancellor Guildford,' p. 473; Hallam, ii. 151. It is worthy of note that about the same time, in 1685, the municipal privileges in the province of Brittany, hitherto held independently of the French crown, were violated, and from that time till the Revolution of 1790 the mayors were the humble servants of the king.—'Revue des Deux Mondes,' 'La Nationalité Britannique,' February 15. 1861.

the bishop replied with submission that, knowing Mr. Locke to have been much trusted by the Earl of Shaftesbury, he had watched his behaviour, but had found no ground of offence, and that Locke was at that time absent on the continent from ill-health. But the impatience of the government did not allow of excuses or delay, and an immediate order for Locke's expulsion, dated November 11, 1684, was followed by prompt obedience at Oxford. The king's hostility even pursued him to his retreat in Holland, and a fruitless attempt was made the next year to cause the States-General to surrender him.¹

One event of the day gave satisfaction to the nation. This was the marriage of the Princess Anne, the second daughter of the Duke of York, by his first wife, Anne Hyde, to Prince George, brother of the King of Denmark. The Protestant religion of the prince is said to have been his chief merit, and both the princesses were educated in that faith. During the late proceedings, the Duke of York had been residing in England; by degrees he was re-established as lord high admiral, although, to shield him from the penalties imposed by the Test Act, Charles himself signed the official papers instead of his brother. When, in May, 1684, the duke was again admitted to the council, some even of the Tories wondered by what right an Act of Parliament could be thus set aside by the king.² Strange was the king's situation thus standing between his brother, his destined heir, and that Test Act which rendered the profession of the Roman Catholic religion a bar to all preferment. At this time, too, Charles was himself secretly a Catholic! When, on February 2, the king had an apoplectic seizure, the archbishop and other heads of the English Church were constantly in attendance, but the king appeared scarcely to heed their ministrations. It was intimated to the Duke of York that the king's peace of mind required the presence of a Romish priest, and when he proposed a priest to his brother, Charles immediately consented with eagerness, but added: 'Will it not expose you to danger?' By the intolerant law of that period, it was indeed an act of high treason to reconcile any individual to the Church of Rome. But at such a time the duke could not regard his own safety. It was a most singular occurrence that the priest who happened to be at hand, and was brought to the king, was the same John Huddleston who had helped to save Charles's life after the battle of Worcester, now a Benedictine monk. The room having been cleared of all attendants excepting the Earls of

¹ Lord King's 'Life of John Locke,' p. 150.

² Lingard, xii. 345.

Feversham and Bath—Protestants, but faithful—Father Huddleston was brought in by the back-door in disguise. After the religious rites, which appeared to give him much satisfaction, Charles saw all his illegitimate sons and spoke to them with affection. One only was wanting; Monmouth, ‘the eldest and best beloved child, was an exile and a wanderer. His name was not once mentioned by his father.’¹ The king took an affectionate leave of the Duke of York, wishing him a long and prosperous reign, and recommended to his protection some who might, as he feared, suffer from his death. He expired at noon on February 6.

Utterly disreputable as a sovereign, without honour and veracity, the king’s good nature and easy manners had yet rendered him popular with the people, and great numbers repaired on the last morning to the churches to join in prayer for his recovery. Heartless as was Charles’s gaiety, it won for him popularity. When James interceded for Lord Stafford’s life, and Charles might have been supposed to have consented to the execution with pain, he was as sprightly as ever at his *couchée* that day.²

Colonies of importance were founded during this reign. By the king’s marriage to Catherine of Portugal, England acquired Bombay, the first part of India which fell under the rule of British merchants. India was already famous for its wealth and its products.

North America remained still for the most part a wilderness. In 1667, the English obtained from the Dutch, by treaty, possession of the settlement then called New Amsterdam, which received the name of New York from the title of the king’s brother. Charleston and Carolina were so named from King Charles II.; and the names Cooper and Ashley, given to two of the rivers in that region, bear witness to the patronage afforded the first settlers in Carolina by Lord Shaftesbury, who employed Locke to draw up the fundamental laws of the state, in which the earl endeavoured to establish, as far as possible, religious liberty. The passing of the Conventicle and Test Acts occasioned a large emigration to North America; and in 1681, William Penn, the celebrated Quaker, to whom, on account of his father, Admiral Penn, the English government stood largely indebted, obtained, in place of money, the extensive province to the north of Maryland, to which he gave the name of Pennsylvania. Penn was desirous not to rest his title to the land on the king’s warrant alone, but to obtain the good-will or

¹ Macaulay, i. 438.

² Lingard, xii. 262, note.

the Indian chiefs who were the first possessors. Convening a meeting with them in that part of the wild country on which he afterwards founded the city of Philadelphia—to which he went unarmed, accompanied by a party of English friends—Penn endeavoured, through an interpreter, to explain the conditions on which he purchased the land. He determined that any offence committed against an Indian should be punished with the same severity as if against an Englishman, and made perfect civil and religious liberty the basis of his constitution.

‘This treaty,’ says Voltaire, ‘was the only one made between these people and the Christians which was not ratified by an oath, and the only one which was never broken.’ Numbers of European settlers gladly availed themselves of Penn’s protection.

He returned to England shortly before the death of Charles, but made subsequent visits to the colony which he had so successfully founded.

CHAPTER XXXI.

JAMES II.

A.D. 1685-1688.

JAMES well knew the slippery ground on which he stood when he ascended the throne. During the late king's illness he had ordered the ports to be closed and strong bodies of troops to be stationed about London; but the people, although far from rejoicing in the change, broke out into no excesses. The new king declared in his first address to his council that he would maintain the government of both the Church and State without alteration, and should endeavour to show the same clemency and tenderness towards his people as had been manifested by the late king. And, although these appear but formal expressions, the Lords requested that the royal speech might be printed, 'as containing matter of great satisfaction to jealous people.'¹

The bishops presented a very loyal address, and on the first Sunday of the new reign the virtues of King James were extolled in many Protestant pulpits. 'We have now for our Church,' said one loyal preacher, 'the word of a king, and of a king who was never worse than his word.'²

Serious people noticed with satisfaction that James encouraged no buffoonery or profane language; but the loyalty of strict Protestants was severely tried when the doors of the royal oratory were thrown open to all observers, who could at Easter behold the rites of the Church of Rome once more performed at Westminster with the ancient splendour, after an interval of a hundred and twenty-seven years. Notwithstanding this open profession of Catholicism in defiance of the existing Test Act, which constituted that faith a disability for office, so respectable in the sight of all men is a candid avowal of personal

¹ Evelyn's 'Memoirs,' iii. 135. It was an extemporaneous address.

² Macaulay, i. 445.

conviction, that had James, in the spirit of his first address, forborne from all interference with the religious opinions of others, respect would have been paid to his own consistency.¹

But the king insisted upon being attended, at least as far as the door of the chapel, by his ministers, one of whom, his brother-in-law, Lord Rochester, the high treasurer, feared to draw upon himself popular dislike by complying with the command. The clergy began to publish tracts against Popery; but the king summoned the bishops, and warned them that his protection depended on their good behaviour.²

James was crowned with the queen on April 23, the feast of St. George, and a stately banquet in Westminster Hall succeeded to the service in the Abbey.

The addresses which were sent to the king from public bodies and from all parts of the country expressed great loyalty, and determined hostility to the party which had brought forward the Exclusion Bill. Oxford and Cambridge declared themselves devotedly attached to the present occupier of the throne.

The recent alteration of so many charters had rendered most corporate bodies the nominees of government; nevertheless, when Parliament was summoned, great pains were taken to influence the elections, and the Earl of Bath was busily engaged in the West of England, exchanging and altering charters. 'Some called him the prince-electors,' says Evelyn; who also states that on the part of government 'very mean and slight persons,' 'even clerks and gentlemen's servants,' were put forward as candidates, such as might be easily overawed. In the remodelled boroughs no opposition was possible; but Whigs were still numerous among traders and artisans, and among the yeomanry and peasantry. In some county elections military assistance was required to put down the turbulence of the people; but the general result was highly favourable to the government, and James asserted that, with the exception of about forty members, the House of Commons was such as he might himself have selected. According to the existing law, it was in his power to retain that Parliament to the end of his reign.³ The king opened Parliament on May 22. He renewed his promise to protect the Church of England, and requested a

¹ This is expressed by Evelyn, iii. 185.

² Lingard, xiii. 8.

³ Macaulay, i. 481. In Buckinghamshire the son of Lord Wharton, who had supported the Exclusion Bill, triumphed over the Tory candidate, whom the lord chief justice went down in person to support. The sons of Hampden's constituents appear to have gloried in their independence.

settlement of the same revenue for life as had been conferred upon his brother.

He informed Parliament that a body of rebels had landed in Scotland, headed by the Earl of Argyle, whom it would be his first object to subdue. The Houses responded according to the king's desire; but Mr. Seymour, a county member, ventured to censure with severity the compulsory surrender of town charters and the influence which had lately been exerted at the elections. Sir John Lowther, who afterwards spoke on this subject, declared that the substitution of new for ancient charters had shaken the very foundation of Parliament by transferring the choice of representatives to other electors, and proposed that a committee should be appointed to consider the question.¹

Immediately after his accession, James not only enjoined the judges to discourage prosecutions on matters of religion, but also ordered by proclamation the discharge of all persons who had been imprisoned for refusing the oaths of allegiance and supremacy. Catholics and Quakers, to the number of 1,200 each, were consequently liberated. Yet this act does not appear to have been the effect of general kindness or of enlightened toleration in the king, but rather of his own sense of insecurity as long as the faith which he professed continued under persecution.² In thus mitigating by a lenient administration the severity of the law, James 'only exerted a power which has always belonged to the crown.'³ But he severely tried the loyalty of his subjects; and when the violation of the charters was under discussion, the proposer of that question asserted that the Test Act was in danger, an Act which he called the rampart of the Protestant religion.

It could not be expected that the king should forgive the atrocious calumnies which had been circulated against him by Titus Oates and the other witnesses who supported the 'Popish Plot.' Two bills of indictment for perjury had been found against Oates, a few weeks before the death of Charles, and when, on May 7, his trial began, Westminster Hall was crowded with spectators. Although all intelligent persons had been convinced of the iniquity of Oates in fabricating charges against innocent men, a considerable number of low enthusiasts still regarded him as a martyr.

It was now in vain that Oates appealed to some members of those Parliaments which had credited and rewarded his

¹ Lingard, xiii. 20.

² Lingard, xiii. 9, 10.

³ Macaulay, i. 517.

testimony. They were either absent or refused to speak on his behalf; one of them, the Earl of Huntingdon, bitterly reproaching him with having deceived Parliament and been the means of shedding innocent blood. The unhappy culprit was assailed by a storm of invective from both the bar and the bench, and was sentenced to undergo such severe whippings through the streets of London, besides exposure in the pillory, as would in all likelihood cause his death. Not having the power of inflicting a capital sentence for his crime, the judges substituted merciless floggings, which soon became an ordinary punishment for political misdemeanours even of a light character.¹ The slanders spread abroad by Oates and Dangerfield called for the punishment, but could not justify the torture, of those lying witnesses. As if to prove the character of Chief Justice Jeffreys, and the sincerity with which King James advocated religious liberty, a man of learning and piety, eminent among the Puritan clergy, was arraigned before the Court of King's Bench. Richard Baxter had acted as a chaplain to the Parliamentary army, but had exerted himself to check the fanatical violence of the soldiery. He disapproved of the execution of King Charles, and at the Restoration hoped that a union might have been effected between Episcopalians and Presbyterians, as he valued the great principles of Christianity far more than the forms which had been the source of so much bitterness. He had refused to be made Bishop of Hereford, and, after spending many years at Kidderminster as a clergyman, retired to private study. In a Commentary on the New Testament, Baxter had complained with severity of the persecution of Dissenters, and on this account an information was brought against him. His appeal to Jeffreys to grant him sufficient time for preparation, was replied to by insults and anger; even the barristers who defended him incurred the wrath of this judge. Besides the testimony of Nonconformists, several clergymen of the Established Church bore witness to Baxter's character; but all favourable evidence was disregarded, and the jury, selected by sheriffs who were the tools of government, immediately found a verdict against him. The vindictive wish of the chief justice to inflict on him a public whipping was overruled; fine and imprisonment for nearly eighteen months—he being at length liberated owing to the intercession of Lord

¹ Macaulay, i. 488; Lingard, xiii. 17, note. Oates deserved the heaviest punishment; but the death by torture, which appears to have been designed him, was prohibited by law, and afterwards by the Bill of Rights, passed at the beginning of the next reign.

Powis—was thought by the other judges a sufficient punishment.¹

On the meeting of the Scottish Parliament, a letter from the king was laid before them, requiring new penal laws to repress the refractory Presbyterians. In conformity with this desire, a statute was promptly passed which decreed death and confiscation of property to any person who should either preach, or listen to preaching, either in a conventicle or in the open air. Those counties of Scotland where the Covenanters were most numerous were given up to be scourged and wasted by troops commanded by the fierce John Graham of Claverhouse. Under Graham's military tribunal, simple and pious men who were charged, not with any act of rebellion, but with holding the same opinions which had impelled others to rebel, were summarily brought to the gallows. Women also suffered death by drowning, rather than abjure the cause of the Covenant; constant to the last, as their persecutors were implacable.²

Four years had elapsed since the Earl of Argyle, found guilty of treason in Scotland by the iniquitous influence of the Duke of York, had fled to England in disguise and reached Holland in safety. For some time the earl resided so quietly in Friesland, that his place of refuge was not generally known; but, on the unexpected death of King Charles, the leading Scottish and English emigrants assembled for counsel at Amsterdam. There was little bond of union between them, 'except hatred of James and impatience of banishment.'³ Had it not been for the unjust prosecution which threatened his life and deprived him of his estates, Argyle would have remained a quiet subject during the last reign; but every circumstance now conduced to inspire him with aversion to the present king. Poor as he was and deprived of his earldom, he was now assured that his Highland name of MacCallum More would still avail to raise an army sufficient to embarrass the government, so soon as he should show himself on the coast of Lorn. It was determined that Argyle should attempt to invade the western coast of Scotland, and that immediately afterwards the Duke of Monmouth should make a descent on England. The encouraging messages sent to the duke from London revived that ambition which had seemed extinguished during

¹ Macaulay, i. 490-494. He was liberated on November 26, 1686.

² See Macaulay, i. 498-501, for instances of John Brown, the carrier of Lanark, and the two Margarets who were drowned in the Solway. The epitaph on Margaret Wilson, a maiden of eighteen, who was 'tied to a stake within the sea' to perish, is there quoted from the 'Cloud of Witnesses.'

³ Macaulay, p. 541.

his easy life of pleasure at the Dutch court. The Prince of Orange was far from counselling him to attempt to gain the English crown; but temptation overpowered the weak mind of Monmouth.

On May 2 the Earl of Argyle set sail for Scotland, and on the 6th was in sight of the Orkneys. The English government had been already apprised of the approaching danger, and had issued orders for the defence of Scotland. All the clans hostile to the Campbells were set in motion; and Murray, Marquis of Athol, at the head of a large number of his followers, occupied the Castle of Inverary, the ancestral seat of Argyle.

Argyle's first attempt to rouse the Campbells resulted in disappointment. The herdsmen and fishermen were ready, indeed, to obey his summons; but some of the chiefs were in confinement, and others were afraid. But when, according to the ancient custom, he sent through the Highlands the fiery cross of yew to summon all from sixteen to sixty who bore the name of Campbell, about 1,800 men responded to the appeal and assembled on the isthmus of Tarbet.¹ His principal comrades in arms were so injudicious as to insist upon dividing with him the command of this small force. After a series of disasters it was plain enough that the leaders of this unfortunate enterprise had no chance of safety except in flight. Argyle, disguised as a peasant, followed his friend Major Fullarton, but they were confronted at a ford by a party of militia who were expecting to find Argyle. Springing into the water, the earl for a short time stood at bay against five assailants, but was struck down and captured.

A large reward had been offered for his arrest; and although, when Argyle declared himself, the soldiers showed some sympathy, they were not disposed to relinquish their prisoner. The foremost in making the arrest was a man named Riddell, and deep was the abhorrence attached to that name by the great tribe of Campbell.²

The insults which the father of Argyle had brought upon the Marquis of Montrose, thirty-five years before, were now retaliated on the person of the unfortunate earl. He was compelled to walk bareheaded up the High-street of Edinburgh, preceded by the hangman with the sword; at the castle he was put in irons, and even threatened with torture. A trial was declared unnecessary, as he had been capitally condemned

¹ Macaulay, i. 552. Laing states the number of his followers to have been 2,500. — 'History of Scotland,' iv. 170.

² Macaulay, i. 560.

four years before, and he was told to prepare for speedy execution.

Argyle's spirit rose under trial; he endured contumely with fortitude, and on June 30 courageously mounted the scaffold. His insurrection appears to have excited little attention in England; Evelyn briefly recording 'Argyle taken in Scotland and executed, and his party dispersed.' Had he remained for a few years longer in his retreat in Friesland, Argyle might have been recalled to his country with honour, and have been conspicuous among the defenders of a constitutional monarch.

The Marquis of Athol wreaked vengeance on the defeated Campbells, many of whom were hanged without trial, till even the Privy Council enjoined forbearance. Even the nets and fishing-boats, by which those who dwelt on the coast subsisted, were destroyed, and more than 300 were transported to the colonies. The leaders of the English invasion had not waited for the expected news of Argyle's success. On June 17 the Duke of Monmouth landed at Lyme in Dorsetshire, with about eighty followers, displayed a royal standard, and immediately published a declaration. This document contained true charges, as well as atrocious falsehoods respecting James, to whom were imputed the fire of London, and the other old calumnies formerly urged against the Papists. Monmouth promised, on the other hand, complete religious toleration, the restoration of the forfeited charters, frequent meetings of Parliament, and exemption from every abuse of power. To obviate the difficulty concerning his birth, he declared that, having been born in lawful wedlock, he was the rightful king; but that he would await the judgment of a free Parliament, and for the present style himself the Captain-General of English Protestants in arms against tyranny and Popery.¹ The gentry of the West of England, who were mostly Tories, naturally derided a proclamation which contained so many falsehoods. But the middle and lower classes were generally Dissenters, or had something of the spirit of the old Roundheads, and the popularity which had attended Monmouth in the West in 1680 again revived. The people felt that they had abundant reason to dislike the existing government, and before Monmouth had been twenty-four hours in England he had 1,500 followers.

While Parliament proclaimed him a traitor, and offered a reward of £5,000 for his apprehension, he was received at Taunton with transport. There, every man in the streets wore

¹ Macaulay, i. 575.

a green bough in his hat, and every window was adorned with flowers.

A lady headed a procession of young girls who presented to the duke a richly embroidered flag ; little foreseeing the extent of misery which this rashness contributed to bring upon the town. Yet even a week after Monmouth first raised his standard at Lyme, his followers were but men of the lower classes ; no peer, baronet, or knight, no member of the House of Commons, had joined him. On June 20 he was proclaimed king in the market-place of Taunton. It was embarrassing to his partisans that he bore the name of James ; and, to escape confusion, they commonly called their chief ' King Monmouth,' by which title he was long remembered in the western counties.

He proceeded to Bridgewater, where he was received in state by the mayor and aldermen, and was likewise proclaimed king. He took up his residence in the castle, near which was encamped his army of 6,000 men, which would have been a much larger force had the supply of arms been greater.

The Duke of Albemarle, Christopher Monk, the son of the general, was lord lieutenant of Devonshire. On hearing of the invasion, he marched immediately upon Lyme with the 4,000 men under his command, eager at once to crush the rebellion. But when he had proceeded some distance, finding that the invaders were resolute, and that there was danger of the disaffection of the train-bands under his command, he retreated precipitately. The forces of the government soon assembled, and the train-bands of Wiltshire were mustered under the Earl of Pembroke. The Duke of Beaufort, who possessed much of the power and influence of a feudal nobleman, used all his authority in support of the crown, and held Bristol. The University of Oxford testified its loyalty, and the gownsmen hastened to give in their names as ready to take arms in favour of the king. All the troops which could be spared from London were sent westward, and the English regiments in the Dutch service returned on receiving a summons. A gloom hung over London, where all Whigs and Dissenters were under suspicion, and in some places the Puritans were fiercely persecuted. Already the country was beginning to feel that abortive rebellion adds strength to tyranny. After various changes, and being without any definite plan, Monmouth re-entered Bridgewater on July 2, and mounted the lofty tower of the parish church to observe the position of the king's forces encamped, at about three miles' distance, on the plain of Sedge-

moor. He had once commanded some of those battalions which were now arrayed against him, and had with their help routed the Scottish enthusiasts at Bothwell Bridge. 'I know these men,' exclaimed the duke; 'they will fight. If I had but them, all would go well!' He knew but too well that his followers, zealous and courageous as they were, were no match for regular soldiers, and already he mourned the evil counsel which had tempted him over. It appears to have been more in desperation than hope that Monmouth planned a night attack on the Royalists. By the circuitous road which his army traversed, the distance to the royal encampment was nearly six miles: Monmouth headed the infantry; the horse were under the command of Lord Grey, his friend and fellow-refugee. It was about one in the morning of Monday, July 6, when the rebels reached the open moor, where three deep ditches still separated them from the king's forces. One of these had escaped Monmouth's observation. His guide missed his way in the fog; the enemy was alarmed; and soon the horse under the command of Lord Grey retreated in disorder before a volley of musketry from the encampment.

The Somersetshire peasants showed much courage, and were for some time well directed by Monmouth. But the duke was too experienced in military affairs not to know that, as soon as daylight dawned, the conflict must be decided against him. His love of life was stronger than his sense of duty towards his soldiers, and he rode from the field while 'still his foot, though deserted, made a gallant stand.'¹ It was not till all their ammunition had been exhausted, that the poor Mendip miners and clothworkers, many of whom had no arms but their tools, at last gave ground, and more than a thousand fell dead on the moor.

'So ended the last fight, deserving the name of battle, which has been fought on English ground.'

At four o'clock, as the sun was rising, the wounded and defeated soldiers poured into the streets of Bridgewater, spreading dismay among those inhabitants who had favoured Monmouth's cause. The Earl of Feversham, by birth a Frenchman, commanded the royal troops, seconded by Lord Churchill, a much more capable officer.

A considerable number of prisoners were immediately executed, and with superfluous cruelty. Meantime Monmouth and Grey were flying for their lives, not halting till their horses could no longer bear them, when, after disguising them-

¹ Macaulay, i. 610.

selves as countrymen, they proceeded on foot towards the New Forest. But parties had been sent in every direction for their apprehension, and the cottages were strictly examined. Lord Grey was first apprehended; and soon afterwards in a dry ditch, disguised as a peasant, the unfortunate duke, carrying in his pocket a purse of gold and the George with which he had been once decorated by his royal father, together with some raw pease gathered to still the pangs of hunger.

The George was immediately sent to Whitehall as a proof of the identity of the captive, and both prisoners were conveyed to Ringwood under a strong guard.

Monmouth could not hope for mercy from the sovereign whose kingdom he had invaded and whose character he had grossly traduced. All that now remained for him was to die on the scaffold with that fortitude which has been the half redeeming grace of so many brave champions and reckless enthusiasts. But he would not neglect any chance of exciting the king's compassion, and wrote immediately expressing bitter remorse for his guilt, and begging that he might be admitted to the royal presence.

Monmouth and Grey were brought to London under a strong guard. James had no intention of sparing the life of either nobleman; but, contrary both to the dictates of humanity and national usage, he consented to allow them each an interview.¹ Monmouth's arms were bound behind him with a silken cord when he was ushered into the presence of the king whom he called his uncle. He threw himself on the ground weeping, owned himself guilty of a great crime, and abjectly implored for life, maintaining that he had not written the declaration put forth in his name. He even signified that he might join the Church of Rome; but no plea could avail. Lord Grey, when admitted to the royal presence, behaved with dignified firmness. He did not ask for his life; but was permitted to redeem it, though justly forfeited, for the sum of £40,000.²

There was no pardon for Monmouth; and, when all hopes were extinguished, despair gave him the courage needful for meeting the last scene. He declared on the scaffold that he died a member of the Protestant Church, but neither the divines of that nor those of the Catholic Church who attended him offered absolution for his sins. A great multitude of people looked upon his last moments with awe and sympathy, and his

¹ See the expressions of Barillon, the French ambassador.—Macaulay, i. 621, note.

² Macaulay, i. 657.

memory was long fondly cherished in the counties where he was known, and by those who had fought in his cause. But on those unfortunate counties vengeance came down. Lord Feversham left a Colonel Kirke in command at Bridgewater, who had been inured to African warfare. Kirke's military severity was succeeded by the judicial circuit of Jeffreys, afterwards termed 'the bloody assize.' The chief justice, who was by nature cruel and a slave of the court, opened it early in September at Winchester.¹ Hampshire had not been visited by war; but there still dwelt in Winchester the Lady Alice, the widow of John Lisle, one of the judges of Charles, who was afterwards raised to the rank of a lord by Cromwell. This excellent lady, who was known to have regretted the king's execution, had protected many Cavaliers in their distress, and was highly esteemed even by many of her Tory neighbours. But she would not refuse the protection of her house to any of the distressed; and two of the proscribed, Hicke and Nelthorpe, a Nonconformist divine and a lawyer, were known to be secreted there. By harbouring rebels, however, she exposed herself to their fate. Impatient to destroy her, Jeffreys brought on her trial even before the conviction of those whom she had assisted; a verdict of guilty was extorted from an unwilling jury, and Jeffreys the next morning sentenced her to be burned alive that very afternoon. But even the most loyal were shocked at this flagrant inhumanity; and the clergy of Winchester procured a respite of five days, during which intercession was made with the king on her behalf, who, although he did not save her life, caused the sentence to be exchanged to beheading. Clarendon, the king's brother-in-law, could obtain no milder punishment, and in Winchester market-place Lady Alice underwent her fate with fortitude. At Dorchester, in the county in which Monmouth had landed, the judicial massacre began.²

It is said that Jeffreys boasted that he had hanged in this circuit more traitors than all his predecessors had done since the Conquest. Eight hundred and forty persons were ordered for transportation to some West Indian island, with the order that they should not be released for ten years. Banishment to the New England States would have been held too lenient a punishment. Severe scourgings were inflicted on women and young lads, and the parents of those poor girls who had walked in procession to honour Monmouth had to pay a heavy ransom to save their children from prison. The chief justice, indeed,

¹ The words of Evelyn, who was on *friendly* terms with him.

² Macaulay, i. 644.

turned the sale of pardons to excellent account, and speedily enriched himself.

For those without money there was no favour; and Ken, Bishop of Bath and Wells, who wrote in vain to supplicate mercy for the poor people of his diocese, complained that the whole air of Somersetshire was tainted with death. Jeffreys returned to London in triumph, and was immediately made lord chancellor—an honour which, as was publicly announced, was the reward of his faithful services to the crown.¹ But the government was still unsatisfied without victims among the rich Whigs of London. One of these was Henry Cornish, who had been an alderman, before the city was deprived of its charter. The government had hoped to punish him as an accomplice in the Rye House Plot, but no sufficient evidence could be found. Two years had passed, a new reign had begun, but yet Cornish was in peril, for the king and his judges were eager to convict, and corrupt witnesses could be purchased. Cornish was arrested on the Exchange, hurried to gaol; after a few days of confinement, tried, condemned, and executed at the corner of Cheapside. But there was yet a blacker deed done in London, done with the full knowledge of the king. A man named James Burton had been concerned in the Rye House Plot, and had been saved from death by Elizabeth Gaunt, an elderly Anabaptist, who spent her life in relieving the miserable, without regard to their opinions. Through her aid Burton escaped to Amsterdam, whence he returned to risk his life once more with Monmouth, and, having fought at Sedgemoor, found refuge in the house of a barber in Whitechapel, named Fernley. Poor as Fernley was, he resisted the temptation to gain a hundred pounds by delivering up Burton to the government. But Burton turned informer, and to preserve his own worthless life he gave information against Fernley and his former benefactress. On his evidence, both were tried and condemned—Fernley to the gallows, Elizabeth Gaunt to the flames, from which Alice Lisle had been with difficulty rescued. To many it seemed scarcely possible that such a sentence could be executed. ‘But the king was without pity.’² Elizabeth Gaunt died as martyrs die, and left a paper speaking of her ‘fault’ as ‘one which a prince might well have forgiven.’

A London surgeon, named Bateman, who had ventured to

¹ Macaulay, i. 661, and ‘Evelyn’s Diary,’ iii., October 31. See also Lingard, xiii. 64.

² Macaulay, i. 664. ‘Since that terrible day,’ says Macaulay, ‘no woman has suffered death in England for any political offence.’

go to Newgate to dress the wounds of Oates after his cruel scourging, had consequently fallen under suspicion. Witnesses were found ready to swear against him, and he was consequently executed as a traitor.

Everywhere in England the Puritans were discountenanced and oppressed. Great numbers of them, from fear and prudence, now resorted to the parish churches, and those of greater zeal collected together for worship before the dawn or at dead of night. The dread of a civil war, and of what he styled 'an inundation of fanatics,' apparently rendered the pacific Evelyn somewhat callous to many acts of tyranny; but at the beginning of November he interrupted his ordinary records, to dilate in his diary on the news from France conveyed by fugitives and in private letters. Louis XIV. had abruptly revoked that 'Edict of Nantes' by which the most popular of the French kings had conciliated his Protestant subjects, and the heretics were in consequence exposed to the most cruel persecution. Children were torn from their parents, men were forced to the Roman Catholic service, or were executed for a relapse into heresy. The Calvinistic ministers were commanded to quit France; but efforts were made to prevent the emigration of their flocks, lest they might form Protestant communities in some more favoured land. In spite, however, of guards at the frontiers, 50,000 persons are said to have quitted France in a few months, numbers of whom enjoyed a hearty reception at Geneva. The hand of the French king was raised against the Swiss Republic, and the fugitives passed to other lands, some of them enrolling themselves under William of Orange, ready to serve against tyrants in future wars. This ill news checked in some measure the overflowing loyalty of the English Parliament. When bonfires were forbidden on November 5, Evelyn foreboded evil and asked what it might signify. The king had three chief objects in view: to annul the Habeas Corpus Act, that great check on arbitrary imprisonment; to increase his standing army, and to have the Test Act rescinded, which at present debarred Roman Catholics from office.

But the greater number of Tories were averse to favouring the Papists, and did not sympathise with these wishes. James was on the point of asking Parliament to relieve Roman Catholics from the Test Act, and for him the King of France had commenced this persecution at a very inconvenient time. James, accordingly, thought it politic to express compassion for the Huguenot refugees, granted them relief from his privy purse, and desired public collections to be made for them. When

Parliament assembled, on November 9, the king read an address of his own framing, expressing his congratulations on the suppression of the late rebellion, and insisting upon the necessity of increasing the regular army. He acknowledged that he had already employed officers who had not taken the Tests, and that, knowing them to be faithful servants, he should refuse to part with them. The Lords heard the king's speech with loyal acquiescence; but the Commons, having obtained a delay of three days before they commenced their discussion, decided by a majority against the maintenance of a large army, and declared that the king could not legally employ recusant officers. This opposition on the part of the House of Commons, says Evelyn, caused great surprise, for it had been expected that they would 'comply in all things.' The king showed displeasure, and prorogued them for about three months, determining to accomplish that object by his dispensing power which the Parliament denied him the power of doing constitutionally.¹ After the prorogation the peers gave some signs of public spirit. Lord Delamere, who was accused of having abetted Monmouth, on the sole evidence of one discreditable witness, although tried by thirty peers, over whom Jeffreys presided as high steward, was yet pronounced not guilty. The public joy was great at this acquittal. The reign of terror appeared to be over, and the widowed Lady Russell gave thanks 'that some stop had been put to the shedding of blood in this poor land.'²

The king now repented of having allowed collections to be made for the benefit of the Huguenots, which had produced the large sum of £40,000, and had occasioned remonstrances from the French ambassador. To remedy as much as possible the evil of encouraging Whigs and sectaries, the Archbishop of Canterbury was desired to prohibit the clergy from preaching on the sufferings of the French Protestants. Indeed, the same monarch who dilated on the rights of conscience when he tried to annul the Test Act, now ordered that no refugees should receive a share of the subscription unless they consented to take the sacrament of the Church of England. A small book had been lately published on the continent by Claude, one of the most eminent of these refugees, describing the sufferings of himself and many of his brethren. The French ambassador having complained of the circulation of this book, James ordered it to be burned at the Royal Ex-

¹ This is allowed by Lingard, xiii. 62.

² Macaulay, ii. 41. Lady Russell to Dr. Fitzwilliam, January 15, 1686.

change by the public hangman.¹ Evelyn, commenting on this act, speaks of the great influence exercised by the French ambassador, adding that a design appeared to exist among the Catholic powers to destroy all who would not go to mass. James, in fact, openly declared in council that 'kings must stand by each other,' and that he had a 'particular reason for showing this mark of respect to the King of France;' his councillors were silent, but not with the unanimity of approval. When the king required the judges to sanction his use of the dispensing power, four refused their concurrence and were consequently dismissed; the king declaring his determination that upon this point all the judges should agree with him. Shortly afterwards four Roman Catholic lords were admitted to the Privy Council. A still greater infringement of the established laws was committed by the king, in defiance of the warning of the attorney-general, when clergymen lately converted to Romanism were allowed to retain their preferment, and when the deanery of Christ Church, Oxford, one of the highest offices of that university, was conferred on John Massey, whose Roman Catholic tenets were well known.²

To attain power over the Church of England, similar to that formerly exercised by Queen Elizabeth and the first Stuarts, James now gave to Lord Chancellor Jeffreys and six other commissioners authority over all schools and colleges, with power to cite before them both bishops and inferior clergy, and, if need were found, to suspend them. It was apparently the king's intention to renew that terrible court from which the Long Parliament had happily rescued the nation. The Bishop of London was suspended by this tribunal because he had not silenced the Dean of Norwich when he preached against Popery. The great increase of Roman Catholic chapels and the opening of a school in Westminster for the sons of gentlemen, under the management of Jesuits, excited fresh fears among the Protestants. Colonies of monks also established themselves in various parts of the metropolis.³

Riots broke out in London and Bristol, occasioned by these unusual proceedings, which gave the king a pretext for ordering an army of about 16,000 men to encamp on Hounslow

¹ Macaulay, ii. 79, and 'Evelyn's Diary,' May 5, 1686.

² Lingard, xiii. 80. Macaulay, ii. 88. The letter asserts that mass was soon afterwards daily celebrated within the walls of Christ Church.

³ Lingard, xiii. 82. James imperiously desired Lord Rochester either to quit the Treasury or to pronounce Bishop Compton guilty. Compton was suspended from all spiritual functions, but was allowed to remain in his palace and collect his revenues.—Macaulay, ii. 98.

Heath to overawe any fresh ebullition of popular feeling. But 'this encampment,' says Evelyn, 'occasioned many jealousies and discourses.' The heads of the Church of England at length endeavoured to stem the tide of conversion, and the number of theological pamphlets and the zeal of Protestant preachers defied the restraints of the new commission. The king, although aware of his unpopularity, was determined to persevere in his course. The French ambassador described the discontent as 'great and general,' but added, that the king liked 'to be complimented on this subject. He has assured me that he will not flinch.'

In Scotland, religious factions had alternately enforced the severest penalties on each other. Knox, in 1560, had induced the Presbyterians to make repeated attendance at mass a capital offence. James, the self-styled advocate of toleration, in 1685 passed an Act which imposed death as the penalty for preaching in a conventicle, or even for listening to a Presbyterian sermon in the open air.¹

Lord Perth, the chancellor of Scotland, and his brother declared themselves Roman Catholics, and the king sent letters to Edinburgh empowering Papists to hold office. But when a cargo of papistical symbols arrived, directed to Lord Perth, and the people of Edinburgh discovered that there was a Roman Catholic chapel in the chancellor's house, disorders broke out which were not quieted before several of the malcontents had suffered death.

The expressed will of the king that Roman Catholics should be exempted from all penalties, but that the Covenanters should be severely restrained, appeared unjust even to the Privy Councillors of Scotland—a country where the sober, reasonable discontent manifested by Englishmen was almost unknown, and where at that time the orderly were for the most part servile, and opposition scarcely took any form but that of popular fury.²

After much correspondence, James agreed to allow some indulgence to the Presbyterians, though less than to those of his own communion. The Protestant Dissenters were still interdicted from public religious services except by special licence from the government.³

In both Scotland and England the preponderance of Protes-

¹ Macaulay, ii. 113.

² Macaulay, ii. 119.

³ Macaulay, ii. 209. Evelyn notes on March 2, 1687, the proclamation just published in Scotland in favour of toleration, admitting Papists to offices of trust. He adds, 'The mystery operates.'

tants was great; in Ireland the great majority of the people were Roman Catholics, although the English and Scottish inhabitants were in general superior in knowledge and civilisation. The differences of race still more than of religion, and the transfer of land, occasioned perpetual enmity between the adverse parties. It was the king's determination to give the Roman Catholic interest in Ireland a decided superiority over the Protestants, and the remodelling of the Irish army was entrusted to the zeal of the Earl of Tyrconnel, who dismissed from the service all officers on whom he could not perfectly rely. Aware of the instability of his throne, and of the probability of a Protestant successor in his son-in-law, the Prince of Orange, the king determined if possible to secure in Ireland a safe asylum for himself in case of need, or after his death for his family and fellow-religionists. For this great object he solicited the aid of Louis XIV., with whom at the beginning of his reign he had secretly negotiated, and from whom he had also received pecuniary assistance.¹ The king's application was favourably received by the French king, but was not confided either to the chief English minister or to the ambassador from France. It is, however, certain that the English minister, Lord Sunderland, was, as well as his sovereign, a pensionary of Louis.

In January, 1687, Evelyn testified his astonishment that Tyrconnel had succeeded to the situation of lord lieutenant of Ireland, lately held by the king's brother-in-law, Lord Clarendon: 'Popish justices of the peace,' says he, 'established in all counties; judges ignorant of the law and perverting it—so furiously do the Jesuits drive.'² The privy seal and other high offices in Ireland were bestowed on Roman Catholic noblemen. About the same time Lord Rochester ceased to be lord treasurer. James expressed regret at parting with one so nearly connected with him, but declared it needful that those who took a leading part in public affairs should agree with him in principle.

The Test Act, however, remained the law of the land, and James could not persuade either Parliament or the Church of England to part with what they considered the safeguard of Protestantism. The time when the Huguenots were so severely persecuted abroad was not favourable to reposing confidence in wide principles of toleration when avowed by a Catholic king. There could be no affection between King James and the

¹ Macaulay, i. 458; Lingard, xiii. 98, and note c.

² 'Evelyn's Diary,' iii. 221–222.

Puritans. Persecuted as the Presbyterians had been by successive Stuart kings, they had tried to exclude James from the succession, and numbers of them who had risen in revolt had been punished most severely. Great as had been the animosity in England, in Scotland the tyranny on the king's side and the retributive fury of the Puritans had been far greater.¹

But James was now resolved to attempt to conciliate these fierce sectaries whom all his power was unavailing to crush, and, as the only way of freeing Papists from restraint, to emancipate the Dissenters also. Having prorogued Parliament till the end of November, he published, on April 4, 'the memorable Declaration of Indulgence.' Declaring that all religious persecution was both wrong and fruitless, and repeating his promise to protect the Established Church, the king, by his sole authority, annulled a long series of statutes, and authorised both Roman Catholics and Dissenters to hold public worship and to accept office without test.

Those so lately persecuted were now looked upon by the court with flattering partiality, and the change was welcome. Among many addresses of thanks, one was presented from Coventry, signed by above a thousand inhabitants of different sects, warmly expressing gratitude for an act of indulgence which would not only encourage Christian charity, but tend to promote industry and trade. In reply to this James repeated that he had always advocated religious liberty, and would endeavour to establish it by law.² There appeared to be danger that some might forget that the author of this Act of Toleration, so illegally dispensed, had added to the severity of the penal laws against the Presbyterians in Scotland, and had rewarded with the highest honours that Judge Jeffreys who taunted every Dissenter brought before him in terms of especial insult. The friends of the Church of England, however, appealed to the principles of the Dissenters in numerous pamphlets, promising them, in fact, speedy concessions, but warning them of the true character of the king.³ There were great differences among the Dissenters, and a large party, convinced of the insincerity of this plausible toleration, refused to join in any address of

¹ Macaulay, ii. 207. The cruelties, says Mr. Laing, which were committed in the West of England after Monmouth's rebellion hardly exceed those endured by the Presbyterians in Scotland for twenty years.—'History of Scotland,' iv. 173.

² Evelyn, iii., June 16, 1687.

³ A small tract, entitled 'A Letter to a Dissenter,' of which more than 20,000 copies were circulated through the kingdom, produced a great effect.—Macaulay, ii. 219.

thanks to the king. Amongst these were Baxter, Howe, and the celebrated John Bunyan, who, after undergoing long imprisonment and attending religious meetings in disguise, was now at last enabled to preach in open day. The Puritans with difficulty repressed their indignation at measures taken for the aggrandisement of Rome. Strange faces now appeared at the court levée, and among them 'Dominicans in their habits as ambassadors from Rome;' indeed, attempts were made in every direction to advance the Roman Catholic religion.¹ The Prince of Orange was the champion of the Protestant cause upon the continent, and both parties desired to know his opinion of the Declaration of Indulgence. William Penn, the Quaker, was on good terms with the king, and went to the Hague to obtain the prince's approval, but failed in his aim. As members of the royal family, the Prince and Princess of Orange sent the king a statement of their disapproval of his late act, admitting, however, that some part of the declaration deserved confirmation by the authority of Parliament.

They expressed apprehension that if Roman Catholics were admitted to public offices of trust, great evils would result.² For some time the prince abstained from making any more formal declaration of his sentiments; but as it was represented to him that his silence occasioned uneasiness, a manifesto, purporting to be a letter from the grand pensionary Fagel in reply to one written by the direction of King James, was widely circulated on the continent, and 50,000 copies were distributed in England. 'No state paper was ever more completely successful.'³ The surprise of the English court was undisguised when, in May, 1687, James, in their presence, fell on his knees to implore the blessing of the Papal nuncio. The young Duke of Somerset was dismissed from his posts of lord of the bedchamber and colonel of a regiment, because he refused to attend the nuncio in solemn procession. To the duke's observation that if he complied he should violate the law, James haughtily replied that as king he was 'above the law.'

In July Parliament was dissolved. The king had already attempted to break the high spirit of the Church of England

¹ Lady Russell to Dr. Fitzwilliam, April, 10, 1687. ² Macaulay, ii. 233-236.

³ Macaulay, ii. 264. Lingard, xiii. 131-132. This paper was published in Dutch, French, English, and Latin. In this letter, which was intended to conciliate both the Catholic allies of the Prince of Orange and the British Protestants, William was declared to be the opponent of religious persecution, but favourable to the maintenance of the Test Act.

by sending a royal letter to direct that Alban Francis, a Benedictine monk, should be admitted at Cambridge to the degree of Master of Arts. This mandate caused much distress at the university, but Francis was informed that, on taking the prescribed oaths, he should be immediately admitted. He refused to do so, and appealed to the king, who, on April 21, summoned the vice-chancellor and some deputies from the university to appear before the new Court of High Commission. The name of one of those deputies is memorable in the annals of science. Professor Isaac Newton was a steady friend of religious liberty and Protestantism, but too little accustomed to public life to take part in a political controversy.¹

It was urged on the king's side that degrees had been conferred on foreign ambassadors of the Romanist faith, and even, on one occasion, upon a Mussulman. But to this the delegates made answer that for a long time past it had been usual to require the oaths from all, and that no one had been elected who refused to take them. Jeffreys, who presided at the court, silenced the Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge with the same asperity with which he was accustomed to address the barristers.

The clergy of the Church of England had regarded passive obedience as an article of their faith. They had clung to Charles I., and honoured his memory as that of a martyr; they had sorrowed during the Commonwealth, and exulted at the restoration of monarchy. Oxford had been chosen by Charles I. as his city of refuge on account of its loyalty, and had lent its vigorous aid at the time of Monmouth's rebellion. But the imprudence and faithlessness of King James aroused indignation even in that loyal and peace-loving university. The hostility of the undergraduates, and of many Protestant superiors at Oxford, was strongly excited when mass was publicly said daily at two of their colleges.² To repress their mutinous spirit, a newly raised regiment was sent to be quartered at Oxford. About the same time there was occasion to elect a new president of Magdalen College. Royal letters, sometimes sent to recommend qualified persons, had been readily obeyed; but in this case James presumed to exert his influence in favour of Anthony Farmer, a man of loose morals and unstable religion, who had declared himself converted to Romanism. The Fellows remonstrated, and after requesting that the king, if he took part in the election, would favour a more eligible person, made choice of Dr. John Hough, a prudent and respectable divine. For this insubordination, the Fellows were

¹ Macaulay, ii. 282. ² University and Christ Church.—Macaulay, ii. 86 and 284.

cited before the High Commission; but although that court decided against Hough, it was altogether unable to uphold Farmer. Consequently, after some months' delay, another royal letter was sent recommending Parker, Bishop of Oxford, but the members of the college refused to cancel the election of Hough. During the summer of 1687, the king made a progress through several counties, beginning with Hampshire, and extending his course to Cheshire and to those parts of Worcestershire where his father and his brother had received defence and protection. In September he arrived at Oxford, where the students were ranged to welcome him. The king's object was to triumph over the disobedient Fellows of Magdalen. When summoned to attend, they presented a petition on their knees; but James angrily demanded that they should at once admit Bishop Parker, which they still refused to do, although the king employed William Penn as a mediator.¹ The king was determined not to yield, and sent the Bishop of Chester, the chief justice of the King's Bench, and Sir Thomas Jenner, a baron of the exchequer, escorted by three troops of cavalry, to enforce submission. They pronounced against the election of Hough, and commanded that obedience should be rendered to the Bishop of Oxford. The bishop was installed by proxy, only two members of Magdalen attending the ceremony. If James could have been satisfied with his triumph, there might now have been a truce, but he imprudently insisted on an abject apology, which the Fellows indignantly refused to make. For this refusal they were expelled, and it was resolved by the High Commission that those of the party who were not already clergymen could not be ordained. The injury thus inflicted on learned and conscientious men roused public indignation and support. A fund was raised throughout the country for the ejected Fellows, and the Princess of Orange testified her sympathy by subscribing two hundred pounds, to the great joy of the Protestant party.

Bishop Parker did not long survive his nomination. The college then became a Popish seminary, and the Roman Catholic Bishop of Madura was appointed its president.² Roman Catholic service was performed in the chapel, and twelve professors of that faith were admitted as Fellows. It became, says Lingard, 'a motley colony taken from the professors of both religions.'³

¹ Macaulay, ii. 298.

² The name of this bishop, Bonaventure Giffard, is mentioned by Macaulay.

³ The Roman Catholic historian acknowledges that the king's conduct 'betrayed the hollowness of his pretensions to good faith and sincerity' (xiii. 111). Macaulay, ii. 305.

The hopes of Protestants had hitherto been fixed on the successors to the throne. The king's daughters were both Protestants, and had married princes of the same faith. But in the autumn of 1687 it was rumoured that the queen, whose infant children had died, was again likely to be a mother, and it was well known that any child of hers would be educated in the faith of its parents. But although a son of the king must be the legal heir, there was still the probability of a regency before that child's majority; and James, with his Roman Catholic friends, apprehended with dismay that such a regency would devolve on the Prince of Orange, or on his wife. An Act of Parliament alone could guard against such a contingency. To convoke Parliament was perilous; for although, since the alteration of the charters, the town corporations were chiefly Tory, they were still Protestant; they had been offended, too, by the king's late conduct, which had alienated from him many both of the bishops and nobility. Still further steps were considered necessary before a properly loyal Parliament could be called together. A committee of seven privy councillors undertook to 'regulate' the municipal corporations, and in this committee was Edward Petre, an English Jesuit, who was clerk of the king's closet and had great influence in his counsels.¹

The principal local agents, on whom the government relied for *packing* a House of Commons, were the lords-lieutenant, who were ordered to repair to their several counties and report concerning the opinions of all those in subordinate offices. But it became apparent that the nobility were by no means satisfied with their sovereign's measures, and half of the lords-lieutenant refused to comply with these directions. They were immediately dismissed. Among these were the Duke of Somerset and the Earl of Derby, grandson of that heroic nobleman who was executed in consequence of his loyal attachment to the Stuarts.

It was difficult for the king to find any lords of Protestant influence or note who were inclined to accept the vacant offices, and the care of two counties was assigned to the hated Jeffreys, although he possessed little landed property. The steadfast aversion throughout the country to the king's religion ranged even Tories among his opponents. It was in vain that the Earl of Bath, the successful confiscator of charters under Charles II., offered to the miners of Cornwall that, provided they would support the king's views, the trade in tin should be freed from oppressive restrictions. But the king would not be

¹ Macaulay, ii., 61 and 318.

satisfied. Care had long been taken to exclude all Republicans from the commissions of the peace. Now everywhere Tory functionaries were ejected, and the vacant places filled with Roman Catholics or Protestant Dissenters.

But whilst Protestantism checked the loyalty of the Churchmen, the principal Dissenters scorned to merge their patriotic feelings in adherence to a despotic sovereign, however high he might bid for their allegiance with the long-looked-for boon of religious liberty. Many of those Dissenting bodies which had expressed gratitude for the indulgence had become ashamed of their error; and it is said that some old soldiers of the Commonwealth who had been made aldermen were not silent concerning their unchanged aversion to Popery and arbitrary power.¹ At all times, however, some men may be found ready to purchase power by the sacrifice of their principles; so, now, William Williams, who in the last reign had distinguished himself as a supporter of the Exclusion Bill, and had defended the most violent reformers, was not disinclined to preferment. He had been fined £10,000, part of which was still unpaid when he consented to expiate his Whiggism by his servility, was made solicitor-general and knighted, and soon became a favourite at court.²

On April 27, 1688, James issued a second Declaration of Indulgence, confirming peremptorily the contents of that previously published, and announced his intention to hold a Parliament in November, to which he exhorted his subjects to send members favourable to religious liberty. This declaration at first caused little sensation, but the care which the king took for its publicity produced a momentous effect. On May 4, James issued an order that this paper should be read at the time of church service in all established places of worship on two successive Sundays. The days of reading were fixed to be the twentieth and twenty-seventh of May in London and its suburbs, and in the country the two following Sundays. The bishops were also directed to distribute copies of the declaration through their dioceses. The clergy appear at first to have hesitated; it was not possible within that time to collect the opinions of all the parochial ministers, scarcely even to consult all the bishops. They might also apprehend the resentment of the Protestant Dissenters, if they should resist the repeated proffer of toleration. But, happily, the heads of the Dissenters understood the crisis, and, 'with a noble spirit,' ranged themselves by the side of the members of the Church to defend the laws of the realm; indeed, a generous enthusiasm pervaded the

¹ Macaulay, ii. 337.

² *Ib.* 344.

whole Puritan body. Deputations of Protestant Dissenters waited on several of the London clergy, exhorting them to resist the royal command, and their assurances of support were gratefully received.

A meeting of the clergy took place, at which fifteen doctors of divinity were present, and the urgency of the occasion drew Tillotson, Dean of Canterbury, from his sick bed. Still the predominant feeling appeared to be in favour of yielding to authority, till Dr. Fowler declared his determination not to read the declaration, and, his resolution being supported by Tillotson and others of eminence, it received the concurrence of all. A resolution of opposition to the mandate was sent round the city, and speedily signed by eighty-five clergymen.¹

Letters were sent to several of the most respectable prelates, entreating them to come to London; and, as it was apprehended that these letters would not pass through the London post-office unopened, they were sent by horsemen to different post-towns in the country. On May 18 a meeting of eminent clergy took place at Lambeth Palace, where, after anxious discussion, a petition was adopted written by Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury. It disclaimed all disloyalty and intolerance, but reminded the king that the declaration was illegal, as Parliament had, both in the late and in the present reign, denied the sovereign's power constitutionally to dispense with statutes in ecclesiastical matters. This petition was signed by Sancroft and six bishops. The six bishops set off for Whitehall, where they were immediately admitted to the royal presence, James believing that they were about to request only some small alteration of form.² But when he read the petition his countenance darkened, he called it a standard of rebellion, and taunted the bishops with being 'trumpeters of sedition.' Trelawny and Lake, the Bishops of Bristol and Chichester, fired up at the king's words, and reminded him of their efforts to put down the rebellion of Monmouth. Ken, of Bath and Wells, expressed a just hope that the king would allow liberty of conscience to his bishops, as well as to the rest of his people.

The king dismissed the bishops in anger, having declared that he should maintain the dispensing power, and would keep their petition as a remembrance against those who had signed it. Immediately afterwards that petition appeared in print,

¹ Macaulay, ii. 347-349. Dr. Edward Fowler was vicar of St. Giles's, Cripplegate, 'one of a small class,' says Macaulay, which 'united that love of civil liberty which belonged to the school of Calvin with the theology of the school of Arminius.'

² The archbishop had been forbidden the court, and therefore did not accompany them.—Macaulay, ii. 351.

was hawked about the streets, and was eagerly read by the people, as was also a short tract on the danger of submission, the author of which was unknown.¹

There were at this period about a hundred churches in the city and liberties of London. On the Sunday named, the memorable May 20, the declaration was read in only four, and from these the congregation for the most part withdrew, testifying their disapprobation. Samuel Wesley, whose sons were afterwards the leaders of the great religious movement of the next century, took for his text the noble answer of the three Jews to Nebuchadnezzar.² Baxter, whom Jeffreys had insulted and the government had imprisoned, now from his pulpit applauded the conduct of the established clergy.

When June the 3rd came, the day appointed for the declaration to be read in the country, all the clergy, with few exceptions, followed the example set by London. The king was embarrassed by this conduct on the part of the Church hitherto so loyal to his father and to himself. Jeffreys is said to have maintained that the government would be disgraced if the bishops were allowed to escape with impunity, and they were summoned to appear before the king in council on June 8. They were told that a criminal information for libel would be brought against them in the Court of King's Bench; and when they refused to enter into recognisances, pleading their privilege as peers of Parliament, they were sent to the Tower.

An anxious multitude awaited the result of the examination, and when at length they saw the bishops leave Whitehall under a guard, to be conveyed to the Tower in a royal barge, the emotion of the people broke forth. 'Their conduct,' says Evelyn, 'was universally applauded and reconciled many adverse parties, Papists only excepted. Violent courses were every moment expected.'³

Two days afterwards an event occurred which was far from diffusing general satisfaction. 'A young prince is born,' notes Evelyn, 'which will cause disputes.'

The bishops remained only one week in confinement. They were brought before the Court of King's Bench on June 15, and the twenty-ninth was the day appointed for their trial. The people took every opportunity of testifying their sympathy

¹ Macaulay, ii. 353. It was unknown by whose means the petition was printed and circulated.

² 'Be it known unto thee, O king, that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up.'—Daniel, iii. 18.

³ 'Evelyn's Diary,' iii. 243.

and admiration, and they even received letters from Scotland, notwithstanding its hostility to prelacy, assuring them of the good wishes of the Presbyterian body. So strong, indeed, was the popular feeling in their favour that the king's ministers were alarmed, and Lord Sunderland suggested that the birth of the Prince of Wales might be a graceful occasion for an act of pacification. But James had conceived the idea that too great indulgence had occasioned his father's ruin; and resolved to persevere.¹ Such an auditory had never before attended a court of justice as met in the King's Bench to listen to this important trial. Among the crowd were thirty-five peers of the realm. Some of the ablest lawyers of the Tory party had been lately dismissed from government employment, and on the side of the bishops were several eminent men, some of whom had, during the late reign, taken a vehement part in the persecution of the Whigs.

When, after a trial of many hours, the judges summed up the evidence and charged the jury, two declared themselves of opinion that the petition was not a libel. The jury were locked up for the night, and their verdict was awaited with extreme anxiety. When, at ten next morning, the words 'Not guilty' were pronounced by their foreman, the shout raised in court was answered by the vast multitude without, till the cheering reached Temple Bar, and the boats on the Thames echoed the acclamation. The people pressed forward to shake hands with the jurymen, and the bells of all the London churches were set ringing.

The king was in the camp at Hounslow Heath when a courier brought the news, which greatly disturbed him. He had just quitted the camp when he heard the loud shouting of the soldiers, and asked its meaning. 'Nothing,' was the reply, 'but that the soldiers are glad that the bishops are acquitted.' 'Do you call that nothing?' asked the king. Assuredly, it was a sign. At night there were bonfires and illuminations throughout London. At this peculiar crisis the venerable archbishop, always opposed to revolution, and whom only the perverse bigotry of James could have driven into opposition, became for the moment quite a popular hero. Sancroft's heart now melted towards those Nonconformists whom it had been his practice to reprehend with pointed asperity, and in a charge, published within the month succeeding the trial, he recommended the clergy to enter into friendly communication with the

¹ Macaulay, ii. 372.

Dissenters, and join them heartily in exertions to uphold the Protestant cause.¹

It could be no matter of surprise that the two judges who had ventured to speak from the Bench in vindication of the bishops were removed from office.²

A list was required from the higher clergy of such as had refused to read the Declaration, but scarcely any returns were sent in. Even Dr. Sprat, Bishop of Rochester, a member of the High Commission, and who had pushed his loyalty very far, refused to sanction any further prosecution, and resigned his place at the board.³

Disappointed with the Church, the king now tried the temper of the army. A regiment was brought before him which had been enlisted in Staffordshire, a part of the country where there were numerous Roman Catholics. The soldiers were asked to pledge themselves to support the king's views concerning the test, or to quit the service; on which, to the king's astonishment, the greater number immediately laid down their arms. James was silent for a short time, but told the men to take up their weapons.⁴ Lord Tyrconnel, Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, had been for some time engaged in raising from the Irish peasantry a force on which his master could depend, and James was advised to bring over those troops to assist him in his difficulties. Although he knew, by his father's fatal experience, the danger of that experiment, some battalions were brought over, and Irish recruits filled up vacancies in the English regiments. Evelyn notes, on August 23, the crimes which had been committed by these soldiers; adding, 'The whole nation is disaffected and in apprehensions.' The hopes of a powerful party had long been fixed on the Prince of Orange as the eventual successor to the English throne; such hopes had even been excited seven years before, by the proposals of King Charles's government. To disarm an overwhelming opposition, and to preserve the semblance of hereditary succession, the 'expedient had then been devised that James, Duke of York, should be banished for life to a distance of five hundred miles from the British dominions, and that when, on the death of the existing sovereign, the title of King should be given him, and be inherited by any son to be afterwards born, all the powers of government should devolve on the Princess of

¹ Macaulay, ii. 393.

² Evelyn, July 2.

³ Macaulay, ii. 421. The number of the clergymen who refused to read the declaration is said to have been 'little, if at all, short of ten thousand.'—Ib. p. 419.

⁴ Macaulay, ii. 425.

Orange, and afterwards on the Lady Anne, both during the life of James and the minority of that son who should be educated in the Protestant faith. Charles was at that time overawed by the general hatred to Popery, and told his minister that it would not be in his power longer to protect his brother, unless he would conform to the Established Church. But the exclusionists had not been satisfied even with these provisions. It was readily believed that James would attempt to obtain the sovereignty by force of arms.¹

The concessions which Charles had offered were afterwards successfully pleaded in his justification, and a strong reaction took place in which the established clergy took a prominent part. Their pulpits reechoed with exhortations to the duty of passive obedience and with declarations of the unalterable character of hereditary right.² But even Tories and High Churchmen were now driven to regard resistance to oppression as in some rare cases a duty, and the Whigs saw that the time for action had arrived. There appeared to be no hope of gaining a constitutional government except through the interposition of a prince who, although the head of but a small country, was regarded by all Europe as the champion of the Protestant faith and the greatest opponent of Louis XIV. During the spring of 1688, some chiefs of the Liberal party had repaired to the Hague to urge the Prince of Orange to make a descent on England at the head of a strong body of troops, in order to assist in effecting a change of government. But William required a written promise of support from influential persons who represented great interests, before he would embark on so hazardous an enterprise.

On June 20, the same day on which the bishops were acquitted, a formal invitation was despatched to the prince, signed in cipher by seven eminent men who promised him their services—the Earls of Shrewsbury, Devonshire, and Danby, Lord Lumley, Dr. Compton, the suspended Bishop of London, who had directed the education of the Princess of Orange, Edward Russell, and Henry Sidney.³ In this memorial the subscribers assured the prince that nineteen-twentieths of the English people desired a change of government, and that a

¹ Hallam, ii. 131-135; Lingard, xii. 273.

² Hallam, ii. 148. See that historian's arguments in favour 'of excluding an unworthy heir from the succession' (p. 127).

³ Edward Russell was a cousin of the late Lord William Russell, Henry Sidney was a brother of Algernon.

great part of the nobility shared these sentiments, though fearful of avowing them, and that if his Highness were to land at the head of a sufficient force to protect his friends, he would be in a few days at the head of an army far superior to that of King James. They added that it was generally believed in England that an infant who was not really the Prince of Wales had been introduced to deprive the Princess of Orange of her future inheritance. The memorialists appealed with anxiety to the prince to learn whether he could assemble the necessary force without awakening suspicion. For, if the design were to transpire prematurely, the immediate arrest in England of his most prominent friends would endanger their lives and deprive him of their aid.¹ This paper was transmitted to William by Vice-Admiral Herbert, who, after being refused permission to leave England, had escaped to Holland in disguise.

The circumstances of the time were favourable to the enterprise. The prince was not the sovereign of the United Provinces, and did not hold their naval and military forces at his disposal; but he was the recognised head of the Protestant interest, and the States of Holland were aware of the danger to which they were exposed by the league between Louis XIV. and the Catholic King of England.² William obtained from the States an order that their naval force should assemble at Flushing, and he concluded treaties with several German princes to supply men for the defence of the Dutch frontier whenever the native forces should be sent abroad. The Roman Catholic powers themselves had been aroused by the ambitious designs of Louis, and even the Pope entered into bonds of amity with the Prince of Orange.³

But William was deeply sensible of the great difficulties of the projected enterprise. He perceived that it would be ruin to his cause to risk incurring the fate of Monmouth by throwing himself with only a few followers into a country where the people, who had lately suffered so severely for revolt, would be naturally afraid to join him. The English nation would also refuse to recognise an invader surrounded by foreign soldiers as a deliverer; and were he to shed the blood of the people on

¹ Macaulay, ii. 411; Lingard, xiii. 156.

² Lingard, xiii. 133-136.

³ *Ib.* p. 158-159. In August, 1688, Louis accused the Pope of encouraging the Prince of Orange to expel a Catholic king from the throne of England. Macaulay shows how greatly William's power depended on the States of Holland, who were fortunately highly irritated by the oppression exercised towards Dutch Protestants by Louis. See Macaulay, ii. 436.

their native soil, their hearts would be alienated from him as they were already alienated from James.

The prince's declaration, prepared before the projected invasion by the Grand Pensionary Fagel, was translated and abridged by Dr. Burnet. It set forth that William had seen with deep concern the great violations of the constitution which had lately taken place in England, a kingdom with which he was closely connected both by lineage and marriage. The power of dispensing with Acts of Parliament had been so claimed as to transfer all legislative authority to the crown. Legal officers had been dismissed to give place to the servile followers of the government, and Papists had been introduced to civil offices, to places in the army, and even to benefices in the Church. Bishops had been lately imprisoned and prosecuted for exercising their right to petition, and there was an evident intention to assemble a Parliament devoted to the court. Lastly, he alluded to the suspicion concerning the birth of the infant called the Prince of Wales.¹

At length James became aware of his danger, and at the eleventh hour tried by reversing some of his late acts to win back the respect of his subjects. The army was the most considerable which any king of England had hitherto commanded, and new companies were added and additional troops were procured from Ireland and Scotland. He put forth a proclamation solemnly promising to protect the Church of England and to maintain the Act of Uniformity. He signified his intention to replace those magistrates who had been lately dismissed, and, by the advice of the Archbishop of Canterbury, abolished the Court of High Commission. On October 8 the chancellor was sent in state to Guildhall, carrying back the charter of which the city of London had been, six years before, deprived. A few days later, a proclamation appeared restoring the forfeited franchises of all the municipal corporations.² On October 20 the Bishop of Winchester went down to Oxford announcing that, in obedience to the king's commands, he was ready to restore the Fellows recently ejected from Magdalen College, who attended from all parts of England eager to be reinstated. Before that act had been performed, the bishop was recalled to Whitehall, where the king, pressed by his fears and by the prevalence of the report respecting his child, con-

¹ Concerning this poor child, born to a life of failures and disappointment, 'the cry of the whole nation was raised that an imposture had been practised.'—Macaulay, ii. 363–366.

² Macaulay, ii. 464–468.

voked an extraordinary assembly, including all the bishops, peers, judges, and crown lawyers, together with the lord mayor and aldermen of London, to hear the depositions of witnesses and his own solemn declaration concerning the birth of the Prince of Wales.¹ The evidence, which was declared satisfactory, was immediately published. All doubts were at an end with impartial persons, though many still avowed themselves unconvinced. At an earlier time the king's concessions might have conciliated a great part of his subjects, but it was then too late. During three years he had remained inflexible.

On October 16, William took leave of the States of Holland with much solemnity, commending his wife to their protection in case he should fall a victim to his enterprise. The deputies of all the principal towns of Holland attended him to his place of embarkation. On the 19th his armament sailed. It had traversed about half the distance between the Dutch and English coasts, when the wind changed, and after a violent tempest the ships regained the coast of Holland with difficulty. The Brill, which was the prince's vessel, returned to Helvoetsluys on the 21st. Two or three days afterwards the fleet reassembled. Some horses had perished, and one vessel had been lost, but no human lives.

Before the 'London Gazette' spread the news of the discomfiture, William was again ready to sail. His flag bore the arms of Nassau quartered with those of England. The motto of the House of Orange had long been 'I will maintain,' to which words were added 'the liberties of England and the Protestant religion.'² Copies of the prince's declaration just preceded his arrival, and vague rumours were circulated that he had lost many horses by the storm. James was greatly disturbed at the passage in the prince's manifesto which announced that he had been invited over by some lords, spiritual and temporal. He summoned three of the peers, who stoutly denied the imputation, as did also the bishops, although with equivocation on the part of the Bishop of London. Meanwhile William was upon the ocean. His armament for the first twelve hours bore towards the north-west, and it was expected by the English scouts that he would land in Yorkshire. Suddenly, at the prince's signal, the whole fleet made sail for the British Channel, for which the wind favoured them, whilst the same breeze pre-

¹ Macaulay, p. 472. The Princess Anne was summoned to this meeting, but excused herself on the plea of delicate health.

² Ib. ii. 476.

vented Lord Dartmouth from leaving the mouth of the Thames to oppose them.

The conduct of the king after his late concessions, in retaining Jesuits about his person, and placing Papists in situations of trust at Portsmouth and elsewhere, as well as in calling over Irish soldiers, increased the hostility with which he was regarded. Indeed, he 'brought people,' says Evelyn, heretofore so loyal, 'to so desperate a pass that they seemed passionately to long for and desire the landing of that prince whom they looked on as to be their deliverer from Popish tyranny, praying incessantly for an east wind, the want of which was said to be the only hindrance of his expedition with a numerous army ready to make a descent. To such a strange temper and unheard of in former times was this poor nation reduced, and of which I was an eye-witness.'¹ When, favoured at length by that east wind for which so many Protestants had longed, the fleet passed the Straits of Dover on November 3, the flourish of trumpets and the rolling of drums were distinctly heard on the coasts of both England and France.² The prince's lieutenant was Count Schomberg, a German by birth, and lately a marshal of France, who had left the service of Louis XIV. from Protestant scruples.

Herbert, late rear-admiral of England, whom James had dismissed, commanded the rear, and many English sailors had enlisted under his command. It would have been dangerous to have landed at Plymouth, where there was a garrison; but at length all the dangers of the voyage were surmounted, and the fleet anchored in the harbour of Torbay. There the invaders were unopposed by troops, and were immediately assisted by the peasantry. A fragment of the rock on which the prince first stepped from his boat stands in the centre of Brixham, now a flourishing fishing-town, but at that time a lonely haven where ships occasionally took refuge from the tempests of the Atlantic. There was no better accommodation for him than a thatched hut, and bedding brought from the ship was spread on the floor.³ Immediately after the disembarkation the wind again became violent, and Dartmouth, who had already passed the Isle of Wight in pursuit, was compelled to take shelter in Portsmouth Harbour. It was observed that exactly a hundred

¹ 'Evelyn's Diary,' iii.

² Rapin, a French refugee, afterwards the author of a valuable history of England, was one of the prince's followers, and described the beauty of the scene. There were numerous spectators on both shores.—Macaulay, ii. 481.

³ Macaulay says that he has seen a Dutch print of the disembarkation, with the prince's flag flying on the hut, and men bringing in the bedding.—Vol. ii. 486, note.

years had elapsed since tempestuous winds protected England by scattering the Spanish Armada. Exeter was greatly agitated by the news that the prince had landed. The bishop and dean fled. The magistrates, although loyally disposed towards James, opened the city gates on the first summons from the prince's friends.

On November 9, William arrived, and was received at the deserted deanery. The common people were enthusiastic in his cause. The cruelties with which the last rebellion had been avenged had not obliterated the love with which the peasantry of the western counties regarded Monmouth, their 'Protestant duke,' of whose preservation some still, against all reason, cherished a wild hope. And now that a braver champion had come, all the villages round Exeter sent forth their inhabitants, and a vast multitude lined the road and the streets of the city. William went to the cathedral in military state and took his seat in the bishop's chair. After the chanting of the 'Te Deum,' Dr. Burnet read the prince's declaration, and cried 'God save the Prince of Orange!' The prebendaries and singers hurried away, but many fervent voices answered 'Amen.'¹ The Earl of Macclesfield, one of the Cavaliers who supported Charles I., rode in the prince's train at the head of two hundred gentlemen, chiefly English. London was violently agitated when the news arrived that the prince had landed, and the Catholics dared not open their places of worship for fear of the mob.

The first week after the prince's landing passed without his receiving satisfactory assistance. No man of note immediately joined him, and there were no signs of disaffection to the king in the North or the East of England. The royal army which was assembling at Salisbury was superior in numbers to that of William. But on November 14, Evelyn notes: 'The prince increases every day in force, several lords go to him. Lord Cornbury' (son of Lord Clarendon and nephew of James's first wife) 'carries some regiments, and marches to Honiton, the Prince's head-quarters. The city of London in disorder; the rabble pulled down the nunnery newly bought by the Papists. The queen prepares to go to Portsmouth for safety, to attend the issue of this commotion, which has a dreadful aspect.' Further, November 18: 'Lord Delamere appears for the

¹ Macaulay, ii. 371, 488, and 493. See the description of the prince's procession with the negro attendants brought from Guiana. 'The bridge of boats' which was laid across the river Exe, for the passage of waggons, and then speedily taken to pieces, was regarded with much admiration.

prince in Cheshire; the nobility meet in Yorkshire. The Archbishop of Canterbury and some bishops and peers in London address his Majesty to call a Parliament.' To this address James replied that he would call a Parliament as soon as the Prince of Orange should have left England. He rebuked the bishops with severity, and declared that he would receive no flag of truce from the prince. Lord Lovelace, seeking to join the prince, was stopped at Cirencester and taken as a prisoner to Gloucester Castle. The king now left London, having appointed a council of five lords to represent him there, two of whom were Papists, and one, still more unpopular, was Jeffreys. He reached Salisbury on the 19th, where bad news now poured in upon him. The desertion of Lord Cornbury had been followed by that of many men of rank, and William's quarters began to bear the appearance of a court.¹ Lord Danby at York, and the Earl of Devonshire at Nottingham, published proclamations exhibiting the reasons which induced the friends of the constitution and of Protestantism to rise against the king. On November 21 the Prince left Exeter for Axminster, where he stayed several days.

James was ready to fight, but William had the greatest wish to avoid a battle. It was impossible to prevent some encounters, but these were chiefly between British regiments which had joined the prince and the Irish outposts of the king's army, and were, according to rumour, highly favourable to William's cause. James much felt the defection of Lord Churchill, afterwards the Duke of Marlborough, an officer of distinction whose military skill had been shown in the defeat of Monmouth, and who was indebted to the king for his present eminence. When Churchill quitted Salisbury to join the prince, he left a letter of explanation in which he declared that he could not conscientiously oppose the Protestant cause, and in this he appears to have been sincere.² So high an example was speedily followed by other men of consequence. Prince George of Denmark, the husband of the Princess Anne, and the Duke of Ormond joined William. Anne was very strongly attached to Lord and Lady Churchill; she was also sincere in her adherence to the Church of England. When her husband, her friends, and her respected tutor, the Bishop of London, all turned to the side of the prince, it cannot surprise us that she should have joined the party of her brother-in-law. Lady Churchill, Anne's intimate friend from childhood, was with her

¹ Macaulay, ii. 509.

² Macaulay, ii. 255, 516.

in her apartments at Whitehall Palace. The king was known to be returning to Westminster, and Lady Churchill's danger was imminent. Measures were immediately taken for the departure of both the princess and her friend, and on the night of November 25 they escaped down the back stairs of the palace, and by means of a hackney coach, which was protected by the Bishop of London and the Earl of Dorset, found shelter for the night in the bishop's town residence in Aldersgate Street. Epping Forest was then a wild tract; but in that wilderness Dorset had a mansion, in which the fugitives made a short stay. The road leading to the prince's quarters was beset by the royal forces, and it was thought expedient for Anne to take temporary refuge at Nottingham. Her carriage was preceded by Bishop Compton, in military costume, armed with a sword and pistols. A body-guard of gentlemen came forth from Nottingham to meet her.¹ When James arrived in London, on the evening of the 26th, the news of his daughter's disappearance added to his feeling of desolation.

A council was summoned for the following day, which was attended by nine bishops and between thirty and forty Protestant noblemen. The king referred to the petition which he had received before setting out for Salisbury, requiring a free Parliament, and asked their counsel. He was advised to negotiate with the Prince of Orange, forthwith to dismiss all Roman Catholics from office, and to grant an unlimited amnesty to all now in arms against him. The last requirement was particularly unpalatable to James, who burned to punish Lord Churchill; but he at length yielded to persuasion, and granted a free pardon by proclamation, also announcing that Parliament should be immediately convoked.

On December 2, Evelyn writes: 'Plymouth declared for the prince; Bath, York, Hull, Bristol, and all the eminent nobility and persons of quality through England, declare for the Protestant religion and laws, and go to meet the prince, who every day sets forth new declarations against the Papists. The great favourites at court, priests and Jesuits, fly or abscond. Everything till now concealed flies abroad in public print, and is cried about the streets. Expectations of the prince's coming to Oxford. The Prince of Wales and great treasure sent privily to Portsmouth. Address from the fleet not grateful to his Majesty. The Papists in office lay down their commissions and

¹ Macaulay, ii. 521.

fly. Universal consternation amongst them; it looks like a revolution !'

Protestant feeling had indeed prevailed over the Tory principle at Oxford. The magistrates went in state to welcome the Earl of Lovelace, now commanding irregulars, after liberation from confinement by the people of Gloucester. Some of the heads of colleges sent a messenger to assure the prince of their sympathy, and that they would gladly coin their plate for his service.

James, however, privately assured the French ambassador that he had no intention of allowing a Parliament to impose upon him unendurable concessions. He knew the temper of his troops, and that only the Irish would stand by him, and his aim was to gain time by pretending to negotiate, and after shipping off his wife and child, to take refuge himself in Ireland or in France. Lord Dartmouth had done all in his power to obstruct the landing of the Prince of Orange, but he refused to assist in conveying the Prince of Wales to France. He wrote to the king, declaring that he had gone as far in his service as was compatible with duty, but he could not put the heir-apparent of the crown into the hands of Louis. The child was brought back to London. Next to the Prince of Wales, the Great Seal was the king's chief object of anxiety, and to protect it from falling into the hands of his enemies, James ordered Jeffreys to quit his usual residence for a small apartment at Whitehall.¹

The prince had been gradually advancing towards London, and met the king's commissioners at Hungerford, in Berkshire, on December 8. The terms proposed by the king were that the prince should await the coming Parliament and should not meantime bring his army within thirty miles of London. William, wishing to leave the direction of the great impending revolution as much as possible to the English leaders, retired from the discussion to a manor-house adjacent, reserving for himself the last decision. The majority of his adherents would have entirely repulsed the king's proposal, had not the prince declared himself willing to await the decision of Parliament, and to keep within the prescribed limits. He stipulated that the king's forces should also withdraw to the same distance east of London, and that the Tower and Tilbury Fort, the most important fortresses within the intervening circle, should be entrusted to the care of the London magistrates. These and some other moderate proposals were expressed in

¹ Macaulay, ii. 529.

writing and entrusted to Lord Halifax, and a parting banquet was given to the commissioners.

But James was not disposed to await the promised Parliament; he was eager to seek safety in flight. His first anxiety was to send away his queen and son, and they left the palace on December 9, in rain and darkness, and in an open boat, for Lambeth, where was a carriage which took them to Gravesend. James heard at the same time of the queen's embarkation, and of the prince's proposals, which, as he allowed, were more favourable than he had expected. He summoned the lords who were in London, and the lord mayor and sheriffs, informed them that he had judged it expedient to send his wife and child out of the country, but declared his resolution to remain at his post. A meeting of peers was arranged for the following day.

But at the moment when James uttered this unmanly falsehood, he had prepared for his secret departure.¹ Having entrusted some of his most valuable articles to the care of the foreign ambassadors, and having burned the writs for convoking a new Parliament, he secretly left the palace at three in the morning of December 11, desiring the young Duke of Northumberland, who slept in his chamber, not to let his flight be immediately known. The king took the Great Seal with him, and flung it into the Thames when crossing at Millbank, whence, after some months, it was drawn up in a fishing-net. He travelled with all possible despatch to the place near Sheerness where was the vessel in which he hoped to sail. But the wind on the 12th was adverse, and when the vessel was about to put off it was boarded by some fishermen, who had heard of the king's disappearance, and who compelled the passengers to land, treating the king, whom they mistook for a priest, with great rudeness. When James was recognised by the people they assured him that he need not fear personal danger, but they secured him as their prisoner.

The Earl of Winchelsea, who happened to be at Canterbury, hastened to the king's protection as soon as he heard of the arrest. December 11, when the king's flight became known in London, was a day of trouble and dismay. There was no regency, no centre of authority. Lord Rochester, closely connected with the king, and who had hitherto firmly adhered to him, now urged the chiefs of the army to declare in favour of the Prince of Orange. The peers proceeded to Guildhall, where they were received with fitting honour by the magistrates, and the archbishop presided at an assembly of the highest personages in the

¹ Macaulay, ii. 552 and 569.

land, who agreed to send a deputation to the prince. They declared that as the king's flight had extinguished their hope of seeing a speedy redress of grievances by Parliament, they had determined to join the prince, and impatiently awaited his arrival, until which they would hold themselves responsible for the maintenance of order. Lord Feversham, who had the command of the army, had already dismissed his troops. A groundless apprehension of the disbanded Irish soldiers added to the tumult of the people, and for two nights the London populace broke out into great excesses. Several Roman Catholic chapels and the residences of some ambassadors were destroyed, also the fine library of the Spanish ambassador. Search was made for Roman Catholic priests, and the Pope's nuncio was fortunate in escaping in disguise. There was one person, Protestant as he called himself, more hateful to the people than any of these. Fearful of the popular frenzy, Jeffreys disguised himself as a common sailor, and shaved off his eyebrows; but when he ventured to look out from the window of an alehouse in Wapping, he was immediately set upon by the mob, who would have torn him in pieces had not some of the train-bands carried him before the lord mayor. The wretched man implored to be carried to the Tower for safety, to which he was escorted under a strong guard, the multitude pursuing with their execrations the carriage which conveyed him. On the morning of December 13 an embarrassing rumour reached London: James had been detained, and shortly afterwards a messenger arrived from Sheerness bringing to the lords a letter, in the king's hand, which implored the aid of all good Englishmen. Lord Feversham was ordered to hasten with a troop of life-guards and to set his Majesty at liberty.¹ Archbishop Sancroft, from the moment when he heard of the king's detention, absented himself from the sittings of the peers. Those who had stopped the king's flight had made the work of the prince more difficult. The king, who had but just implored his captors for liberty to depart, resumed the tone of a monarch, addressing a letter to the prince, who was at Windsor, with the request that he would meet him at Westminster, and offering him the use of St. James's Palace. William put Feversham under arrest, and declined the interview with the king, whom he requested to remain at Rochester. But James

¹ 'The king's detention,' as Hallam observes, 'gave a different colour to the state of affairs.' General disgust was felt at his desertion of the kingdom; but when he returned and again assumed the government, William was compelled to make use of intimidation.—'Constitutional History,' ii. 253-254.

arrived in London on the 16th. He had feared the rage of the people, but the people had expended their rage on the Papists, and there was even some sign of reaction in the king's favour when he returned to Whitehall.

The Roman Catholics again appeared in public. When the king attended mass at his chapel there was, according to Evelyn, more than the usual congregation, and it appeared to the courtiers as if all things were restored to their former state.¹ But this state of affairs could not go on. William's court was now crowded with eminent men of all parties, and the prince consulted them on the course to pursue towards his father-in-law, whom he wished to induce to retire immediately from London. It was agreed that a splendid villa at Ham should be offered for his place of retreat. It was after midnight when three noblemen commissioned by William brought the prince's letter to the king; they announced that the prince would arrive in a few hours. The Dutch soldiers were at Chelsea and Kensington, and battalions ready for action had already approached the palace. It was suggested that it would be well for the king to set out next morning for Ham. James replied that he should prefer Rochester, and to that proposal William gladly acceded, for Rochester was on the road to the coast, and it was the prince's earnest wish that James should leave the country.

It was raining on the morning of December 18, when the royal barge came to Whitehall-stairs. Several boats surrounded it, filled with Dutch soldiers. Evelyn, who was among the noblemen and others who attended the king to the waterside, called it 'a sad sight,' and the feeling was natural, for it is

heavy responsibility to displace a sovereign. 'The prince,' continues Evelyn, 'comes to St. James's, and fills Whitehall with Dutch guards. A council of peers meet about an expedient to call a Parliament.'²

While the king's barge worked its melancholy way down the river a great multitude assembled near St. James's Palace to greet the prince, every hat being adorned with orange ribbon in compliment to his hereditary title. The bells were ringing throughout London, and there were all the usual signs of rejoicing. William, who disliked all display, reached St. James's as quietly as possible through the park. In a short time, 'all

¹ Evelyn's letter to his son, iv. 285.

² Evelyn sometimes brings events too closely together, as if writing his diary after some lapse of time. The peers met at St. James's on December 21.—Macaulay, ii. 590.

the world went to the palace,' and Evelyn reports that the prince was 'very stately, serious, and reserved.'

The London magistrates, bishops, clergy, and about a hundred Nonconformist ministers, arrived to pay their respects, and the lawyers were headed by the aged Maynard, who had been employed against Lord Strafford, about forty-eight years before, and now remained clear-headed at ninety years of age.¹

But the serious question was now to be considered, by what right should the Prince of Orange claim to be King of England? Some of the prince's advisers, some eminent lawyers being of the number, advised him to assume the crown as his own by right of conquest, and then as king, send out writs calling a Parliament. It was thus that Henry VII. had established the Tudor dynasty. If the transference of sovereignty were not the consequence of force, it was difficult to say how it could be legally effected, for neither the law nor the Church of England acknowledged that the people possessed a right to depose their sovereign. But the prince had protested in his declaration that he had no design of conquering England, but came over by invitation to protect the constitution, which had been invaded; and his force of 15,000 men would evidently have been quite insufficient to prevail against the army and navy of England, had these been arrayed against him. With prudent consideration both of his past promises and of the national pride, William determined to be true to the terms of his declaration, and to leave the task of settling the government to the Legislature. The peers were summoned to St. James's on December 21, and requested to confer concerning the state of the country. All those gentlemen who had been in the House of Commons during the reign of Charles II. were also summoned, and the aldermen and deputies of the Common Council of London.²

There was, meantime, a strong party of Royalists, at the head of whom was Archbishop Sancroft, who still hoped to make terms with James and to secure the laws and religion of England without incurring the guilt of disaffection to their monarch. They sent letters to Rochester imploring James to make such concessions as might yet conduce to a favourable adjustment; but the apprehensions of personal danger which

¹ 'You must, Mr. Serjeant,' says the prince, 'have survived all the lawyers of your standing.' 'Yes, Sir,' said the old man, 'and, but for your Highness, I should have survived the laws too.'

² Macaulay, ii. 587-590.

James had conceived urged him to immediate flight, and William ordered that no check should be put upon his movements. He did not wish personally to injure or to imprison his uncle, but he strenuously desired his speedy departure. On the night of December 22, James went on board a small skiff which was in waiting in the Medway, and on the 25th reached France in safety. He left a letter, which was not, however, satisfactory to his friends, for it contained no expressions of regret for past errors, or hopes of future amendment, only denunciations of William and of the blindness of the nation.

In accordance with the request of the two councils, the prince immediately issued letters summoning a Convention-Parliament, himself meanwhile directing the administration of government and taking vigorous steps for the restoration of order. Money being wanted, and no Parliament existing to vote supplies, the Common Council engaged to furnish the prince with £200,000; and it was considered a great proof both of the riches and the public spirit of the London merchants, that the whole sum was supplied by them in two days, on the sole security of the prince's word.¹

The Dutch nation had looked on with anxiety for the result of their prince's hazardous expedition, and their delight in his success was great. On January 8, envoys arrived in England to congratulate William on the part of the States.

The elections went on rapidly and with scarcely any contests, for the people of England had been during more than a year looking for a Parliament, and now in many cases elected the candidates whom they had before determined to send if the king would give them the opportunity. Four zealous Whigs were elected by the citizens of London.²

The difference between the leading principles of the Whigs and Tories was at this period decided. The Whigs were attached to monarchy and in general adverse to violent changes, but they held the constitution to be of even more supreme consequence than the person who occupied the throne, and maintained that a sovereign who violated the laws and grossly abused his power might be lawfully dethroned. The Tories could not agree to this principle; but even they had diverged in some degree from their 'sacred duty of non-resistance,' and, although still feeling bound to James as to their hereditary monarch, wished to obtain from him some engage-

¹ Macaulay, ii. 597.

² In the year 1685, London, deprived of its charters, had returned four Tory representatives, but the old charter had been now restored.

ment respecting his future conduct. A really limited monarchy cannot long exist in a country where the royal office is regarded as a divine right existing in one family, without regard to the happiness of the people.

The Whigs were now prepared to declare the throne vacant, to nominate the prince as the fitting person to fill that vacancy, and to impose on him such conditions as might guard against future misgovernment.

At daybreak on January 22 the Convention-Parliament met. It was properly so called, for it had not received a royal summons. One of the members, sent by the University of Cambridge, was Sir Isaac Newton, an 'unobtrusive but unflinching friend of civil and religious liberty.'¹

In the House of Commons there was no difficulty in passing a nearly unanimous vote that King James II., having endeavoured to subvert the constitution of the kingdom by breaking the original compact between king and people; having, by the advice of Jesuits and other wicked persons, violated the fundamental laws, and having withdrawn himself out of the kingdom, had abdicated the government, and that the throne was consequently vacant. Immediately after this resolution was carried to the House of Lords, the Commons voted that it was inconsistent with the safety and welfare of this Protestant nation to be governed by a Popish king. The latter resolution met with the unanimous assent of the peers, but the first occasioned much controversy. The primate and other chiefs of the Tory party were ready to allow that James had forfeited the obedience of his subjects, but urged that if a regency were appointed to which the actual government should be transferred, the monarchical principle would be uninfringed, as writs might still be issued, and Acts of Parliament recorded in the name of James. This proposal was warmly contested. In a house of a hundred peers, forty-nine voted for a regency, fifty-one against it. All the noblemen allied to the Stuarts, the Archbishop of York and eleven bishops, voted in the minority.² In the view of the Tory party there was much less difficulty in giving the crown to the Princess of Orange than to her husband, and some would have conferred the royal title on Mary alone.

The day after the debate concerning the regency was

¹ Macaulay, ii. 624; Hallam, ii. 254.

² Macaulay, ii. 637. No prelate voted in the majority except Compton and Trelawney. Sancroft, the primate, was not present, although the plan of the regency was suggested by him.

January 30, sacred, according to the English Prayer-book, to the memory of King Charles I. This was a difficulty for the London clergy, most of whom omitted the prayers for King James. Sharp, Dean of Norwich, however, not only read the usual service, but also implored a special blessing for the king, and preached against what he termed the 'Jesuitical doctrine' that princes might be lawfully deposed by their subjects. The Speaker complained immediately of the affront, but the House, thinking it unwise to quarrel with the clergy, dropped the matter. Parliament had already unanimously appointed a day of thanksgiving for the national deliverance from tyranny, which was observed on the following day, January 31, when the Lords attended at Westminster Abbey, and the Commons listened at St. Margaret's to Dr. Burnet, whose 'vigorous and animated discourse' was afterwards printed and translated into French for the benefit of foreign Protestants.¹ But when, after attending the service at the abbey, the Lords resumed their deliberations, they refused by a small majority to declare the prince and princess king and queen, as the Whigs desired, or to agree that the throne was vacant. 'Some,' says Evelyn, 'were for sending to James with conditions. In short, all tended to dissatisfaction on both sides.'

The prince was at length weary of this indecision, and sent for Lords Halifax, Danby, Shrewsbury, and some others, to whom he explained that he had hitherto kept silence, from the wish to abstain from dictating terms to the Convention; but that, if the desire for a regency predominated, he thought it right to declare that he would not be the regent. Another party had signified the intention of placing the princess on the throne, and of allowing him during her life the title of king, with such share in the administration as she might concede to him. He could not stoop to accept such a post. He was sincerely attached to the princess, but could not consent to be subordinate to her. He would only undertake the government of England on receiving the crown for life; if that were not given him, he would return to Holland. He added that it appeared to him just that the Princess Anne and her children should succeed him and the queen; their claim being preferred to that of his children by any other wife than the Lady Mary. Mary had previously written to Lord Danby, stating her full determination, even in case she had regularly succeeded to the English throne, to surrender all power to her husband, and

¹ Macaulay, ii. 643.

declaring that she would never consider any person as her true friend who should set up her interest in opposition to his.¹

It was now clear to both Houses of Parliament that William must be king, and they agreed without further opposition that William and Mary should formally reign together. Their heads should both appear on the coin, and writs be issued in their joint names; but the administration should be conducted by William alone. After a conference between the two Houses, those peers who had supported the proposal for a regency either absented themselves or yielded to circumstances. A resolution was therefore immediately carried that the Prince and Princess of Orange should be declared King and Queen of the English dominions.

A committee had been appointed by the House of Commons to investigate the state of the laws and to take needful steps for rendering future tyranny impossible. But although a report had been drawn up which contained good suggestions, it was needful to postpone their discussion till after the settlement of the crown. It was determined, however, that the instrument by which the prince and princess were called to the throne, and which fixed the order of succession according to the prince's recommendation, should also set forth in the most distinct language the fundamental principles of the constitution. John Somers, afterwards lord chancellor, was chairman of the committee which prepared this paper, called the Declaration of Right. It was framed and approved by the House of Commons in a few hours, and was accepted with small alterations by the peers. In acting thus, the Convention-Parliament was justified, according to the best judges, 'by the solid grounds of political necessity,' rather than by strict argument from established law. 'They proceeded not by the stated rules of the English government, but the general rights of mankind.'² 'Sovereigns,' said Charles James Fox nearly a hundred years later, 'are sacred, and reverence is due to every king; yet, with all my attachment to the person of a chief magistrate, had I lived in the reign of James II., I should most certainly have contributed my efforts and borne a part in that illustrious struggle which vindicated an empire from hereditary servitude, and recorded the valuable doctrine that trust abused is revocable.'³

¹ Macaulay, ii. 646-649. Lord Macaulay says that there is some difficulty in placing these events in correct order, but that he believes that the letter of the princess arrived, and the prince made this explanation, between January 31 and February 6.

² Hallam, ii. 262.

³ Speech on the India Bill, 1784. See 'Memorials of C. J. Fox,' ii. 102.

When James summoned the Scottish regiments to assist him against the prince's invasion, Edinburgh was left exposed to the violence of that large party whose hostility to the Roman Catholic faith and remembrance of past sufferings had long extinguished their loyalty to the race of Stuart. The mob rose, Catholics were obliged to fly for their lives, and the chancellor, Lord Perth, glad, like Jeffreys in England, of stout walls for his defence, was escorted by a strong guard to Stirling Castle.

When the prince arrived in London, the heads of different Scottish parties were there assembled, either to welcome the new power or to receive instructions from the late king; amongst the rest were the Presbyterians, eager to meet their friends returning from exile in the prince's train. William prudently called together an assembly of Scottish lords and gentlemen, and desired their advice concerning their country. After debates which lasted three days, the prince was requested to fix March 14 for the meeting of the estates at Edinburgh, and to undertake the government of Scotland meanwhile.¹

On February 12, the Princess Mary arrived at Greenwich, and was received with joy and affection.

The magnificent Banquet Hall of Whitehall Palace was prepared for the grand ceremonial, which took place on the next day, when, in the presence of a large number of peers and of the Commons headed by their Speaker, the prince and princess took their place under a canopy of state; and Lord Halifax, having first desired the clerk of the House of Lords to read the Declaration of Right, requested in the name of all the estates of the realm, the prince and princess to accept the crown. William, speaking both for himself and Mary, replied that to them the crown had the greater value as being a token of the confidence reposed in them by the nation. 'We thankfully accept,' said he, 'what you have offered us.' He assured the assembly that the laws of England, which he had already vindicated, should be the rules of his conduct, and that he would study to promote the general welfare, and frequently recur to the advice of Parliament.

The applause which followed this address gave the signal for great acclamations in the streets, and the heralds immediately proclaimed the beginning of the reign of William and Mary.

While the English peers were in debate concerning the title to be given to William, the fugitive king had been received

¹ Macaulay, ii. 607-611; Laing's 'History of Scotland,' iv.

by Louis XIV. at the palace of St. Germain's, which was allotted for his residence, and in which all the comforts were bestowed upon him and his queen which the most lavish generosity could confer.¹ The Catholics of France fully sympathised with the ex-King of England. A part of the proscribed French Protestants had joined the army of the Prince of Orange. The great contest of the seventeenth century affected the interests of all Europe.

Two great champions, Louis XIV. and William, were engaged, the one to suppress, the other to vindicate, the sacred rights of conscience.

While the late contest was still going on between the two Houses of Parliament respecting the vacancy of the throne, a letter arrived from St. Germain's. Although that letter was not read in the House of Lords, its contents became generally known. In that epistle James exhorted Parliament not to despair of his clemency, assuring them of his willingness to pardon all, except a few unnamed persons.² Little confusion had been occasioned by the suspension of government. 'No new men, either soldiers or demagogues, had their talents brought forward by this rapid and pacific revolution; it cost no blood, it violated no right, it was hardly to be traced in the courts of justice; the formal and exterior character of the monarchy remained nearly the same in so complete a regeneration of its spirit.'³

¹ See note F at the end of Lingard's 'History of England,' and Macaulay, ii. 602. The ex-King and Queen of England were informed that as long as they remained guests of the King of France, £45,000 a year would be allotted to them from his treasury, and £10,000 were sent immediately to supply their wants.

² Macaulay, ii. 645.

³ Hallam, ii. 253.

CHAPTER XXXII.

WILLIAM III.

A.D. 1689-1702.

THE great revolution which had taken place in England was hailed with the utmost satisfaction in all parts of Protestant Europe, particularly wherever the ambition of Louis XIV. had excited frequent apprehension. William himself fully sympathised with the feelings of those who viewed him as their champion. On the day of his accession to the throne, he wrote to the States-General, assuring them that his elevation would not lessen his attachment to his native land, and that he hoped to protect Holland more efficiently than ever.¹ According to the testimony of an English clergyman at this time at Utrecht, the principal Protestants saw in the English revolution the sole hope of saving the United Provinces from ruin, keeping up the Protestant interest, and hindering the French power from swallowing up all.² Tyranny and bigotry were upheld in Europe by the greatest military power which had existed since the downfall of the Roman empire.³ The last two kings of England, indeed, had stooped to receive pensions from that power, in order that they might be able to govern without Parliamentary control. William, conscious of the importance of his new position, was naturally impatient of the numerous claimants who now demanded offices, and some of these applicants were displeased at finding him 'wonderfully serious and silent, treating all persons alike gravely, and very intent on affairs.'⁴

Some measure was now requisite to change the *Convention*, assembled necessarily without a royal writ, into a legal Parliament. It was urged by the Whigs that it was inexpedient to

¹ Macaulay, iii. 3.² 'Dr. Calamy's Diary,' i. 147.³ Macaulay, iii. 43.⁴ 'Evelyn's Diary,' iii. 272-273.

proceed to a fresh election, and a Bill passed through both Houses to declare the present assembly the Parliament of the nation. In the course of the debates, the new sovereign's personal intercession in favour of his poorest subjects was an unprecedented event. During William's journey to London from Torbay he had been implored by some of the common people to relieve them from the pressure of the Hearth Tax, which had been unequally assessed and collected with great harshness. A peasant who was only worth twenty pounds had been rated at ten shillings, and a nobleman possessed of half a million, at not more than four or five pounds. It is highly to William's credit, engrossed as he was by a multiplicity of business, that he brought forward this subject at one of the earliest meetings of the Privy Council, and he also sent a message to the House of Commons, advising that if the tax could not be collected without injustice it would be well to abolish it altogether. 'To gratify the people,' says Evelyn, 'though not without some expostulations in the House of Lords, this tax was declared a badge of slavery, and was abolished for ever.'¹

It was provided, by the law which gave the name of Parliament to the existing Convention, that no person should sit or vote therein after March 1, without taking the oaths of allegiance to the new sovereigns. This enactment occasioned great disturbance. The late advocates of a regency were not yet satisfied with the change of dynasty, and Archbishop Sancroft and several of his friends stood aloof. Within a week about a hundred peers thought fit to take their seats, but there was little loyalty towards William either in the Church or the army; the soldiers looking with ill-will on the presence of foreign troops. The King of France having declared war against Holland, the States-General requested succour from the King of England, and a Scottish regiment was ordered to march to Harwich for embarkation. But the officers and men broke out into rebellion, declaring that the Convention-Parliament had no power to annul their allegiance to King James, and began to proceed towards Scotland by forced marches. The danger to the peace of the country appeared at first great, as it was apprehended that some other regiments would join, but the prompt measures taken by the king speedily stopped the mutiny. A few of the ringleaders were tried and found guilty of high treason, but were not executed, and the rest were commanded to return to their duty. The regiment obeyed, and by their

¹ 'Evelyn's Diary,' March, 1689.

fidelity through many hard campaigns of active service on the continent, redeemed their lost character.¹ But the course of the new king was beset by dangers from other quarters, arising partly from the want of loyalty in men filling high positions, who, although they had been induced to take part against King James, yielded afterwards to a reaction of sentiment, and were not easily conciliated by the presence of a reserved sovereign, who spoke the English language with a foreign accent, was attached to his Dutch friends, and preferred the support of Protestantism generally to the headship of any particular Church established in England.²

Those of the clergy who refused to take the oath of allegiance to the new government, and were therefore called 'Non-jurors,' proved a formidable party. Their chief was Archbishop Sancroft, who did not appear at the coronation, but shut himself up at Lambeth Palace, delegating to other bishops the duties which he had refused to perform. The House of Commons voted that a respite should be given to the clergy till August 1, before taking the required pledge. 'It was well known that the king was willing, if the Legislature would comply with his request, to let clergymen continue to hold their benefices without swearing allegiance to him.'³ While the Bill respecting the oath of allegiance was under discussion, William went to the House of Lords to give his royal assent, and took the opportunity to address both Houses from the throne, expressing his earnest wish that they would so far modify the laws as to allow all Protestants to be admitted to public employment. But the Test Act, which James had endeavoured in vain to repeal, in order to admit the Roman Catholics in company with the Dissenters, was not to be surrendered at the solicitation of the new sovereign, and the utmost degree of liberality which was considered by Parliament compatible with safety was the passing of the 'Act of Toleration.' By this 'celebrated statute, long considered as the great charter of religious liberty,' the English Protestant Dissenters were for the first time legally permitted to hold public worship; but assent to the principal doctrines, although not to the forms of the Church of England, was still required from all, and ample room was left for those great modifications which were not perfected till the present age. Such as it

¹ Macaulay, iii. 40-42.

² Lord Macaulay calls King William 'the head of the Low Church party.' But the Low Church clergymen were a minority at that time in England (p. 74). Hallam also calls the king 'almost the only consistent friend of toleration in his kingdoms' (ii. 497).

³ Macaulay, iii. 108.

was, however, it proved a healing measure, 'removed a vast mass of evil without shocking a vast mass of prejudice,' and put an end for ever to the persecution, which during four generations had driven thousands of the best English subjects to find new homes in the then desolate regions of North America. The king gave his consent to the Act with hearty satisfaction, and the Puritan divines flocked to the county courts everywhere, to swear allegiance, and to assent to the doctrines required of them.¹

Notwithstanding the Toleration Act, however, and the greater liberality of the king, the Nonconformists remained excluded from office in the State, and the Nonjurors were ejected from the Church.²

The coronation, which took place on April 11, differed in some degree from the usual form, in order to embrace the joint sovereignty of William and Mary. The queen was, like William, girt with the sword, lifted into the throne, and presented with the Bible and the spurs. The members of the House of Commons attended in a body and partook of a sumptuous repast, and there was a large muster of the nobility, including many lords who had voted for a regency; but the show of bishops was scanty, and the place of the primate was filled by the Bishop of London.

There were the usual signs of rejoicing, but less enthusiasm than had been shown at William's first accession, and some looked with jealousy on the Dutch soldiers who guarded the way from Westminster Hall to the entrance of the abbey.

Already the peace of the reign was most seriously endangered, and Lord Halifax, who had been the organ of the House of Lords in offering the crown to William, now expressed apprehensions regarding the stability of the government during the next three months, which would be the time of trial.³

It became known that James had landed in Ireland on March 12, and the Irish Protestants were seeking safety in immediate flight. Two years had just elapsed since James removed his brother-in-law, Lord Clarendon, from the viceroyalty of Ireland, trusting that island to the Popish influence of the Earl of Tyrconnel, in the hope of finding a refuge there, in case of disasters in England. Tyrconnel had closely followed his instructions. The great body of the Irish people were totally averse to submit to the king of the English settlers, and in January Tyrconnel sent assurances to St. Germain's that if an adequate French force should accompany James he would be speedily

¹ Macaulay, iii. 81, 84, 87, 80.

² *Ib.* p. 109.

³ *Ib.* iii. 121.

acknowledged as king. If James should be unwilling to trust to Irish support, Tyrconnel desired his envoy to see Louis XIV. and to offer to make Ireland a province of France.

While awaiting the ex-king's decision, Tyrconnel called the Irish nation to arms, and the call was promptly and enthusiastically obeyed. The flag on Dublin Castle bore the words 'Now or Never,' words which became the watchword of the people. The Irish army soon required a larger supply of officers, and its arms were frequently of the simplest kind; it is said that at the end of February at least 100,000 Irishmen were in arms, only half of whom were soldiers, the rest banditti. The destruction of property was enormous, and it was utterly impossible for the English settlers to offer any effectual resistance, or to defend their country seats from plunder. In the North of Ireland alone there were still some Protestant strongholds. Refugees from Munster and Connaught found shelter at Enniskillen, and the bravest Protestants of Leinster hurried to Londonderry.¹ In these towns William and Mary's accession had been joyfully proclaimed, and behind the ramparts of Londonderry 30,000 Protestants crowded together for safety. James immediately determined to accept the invitation of Tyrconnel, and applied to his magnificent ally for help in the enterprise. By the directions of Louis a fleet was soon in readiness to sail from Brest, carrying arms for 10,000 men, and a large amount of money and ammunition. The cabin furniture and all the requisites provided for the ex-king were most luxurious. On February 15, James paid a farewell visit to Versailles and received from Louis the kindest possible reception.

On March 12 he landed at Kinsale, where he was received with transport by the inhabitants. According to Evelyn, 'a wonderful uncertainty' had for several weeks troubled all England concerning the movements of James, and great dismay was felt at the first news of his landing and success. Much blame was cast on the English government for neglect. It appears, however, that William, at his first accession, had not the means of sending a force to Ireland. A large party in England had been hostile; the army was disorganised; and of the Dutch troops not a regiment could be spared. Before his accession William had attempted to negotiate with Tyrconnel and had sent an agent to Ireland, but the effort had failed.² On March 24, James entered Dublin, and received the most

¹ Macaulay, iii. 154-161.

² Ib. iii. 148.

enthusiastic reception from the people, who were eager to recognise in him a King of Ireland, if not of Great Britain. He summoned a Privy Council, and convoked a Parliament to meet at Dublin on May 7. In the three southern provinces the Protestants had abandoned resistance before the overwhelming and devastating force of the insurrection.

Londonderry, in the North, was the only important post still held by Protestants, and James was advised to proceed thither, in hopes of its speedy capitulation. From Ulster he could easily cross over to Scotland, where also he had numerous friends. But although the Governor of Londonderry, Colonel Lundy, proved treacherous to the new sovereigns, in whose proclamation he had lately taken part, the Protestants had able defenders in Major Baker and Captain Adam Murray, assisted by the eloquence of the Rev. George Walker, one of those who had lately found a refuge in that city.¹ When James drew near to the southern gate of Londonderry, he was met by cannon-balls and a cry of 'No surrender!' and finding, after a short delay before the walls, that the inhabitants were determined to offer resistance, he resolved to return to Dublin, leaving three of his officers to conduct the siege.

On May 7, James—who when he threw the Great Seal of England into the Thames must have apprehended his reign to be over—once more wearing royal robes, and the crown, took his seat on the throne in an old conventual building appropriated as an Irish House of Lords, and ordered the Commons to be summoned.²

Between James and this Parliament there was little sympathy, except in their aversion to Protestantism. Most of the Irish representatives were rude and ignorant men who had suffered oppression for many years, and were unboundedly excited at the prospect of immediate redress. In his first speech James announced his determination to abolish all religious disabilities. He warmly expressed his gratitude to the King of France, and invited consideration of the Act of Settlement. An Act was rapidly passed annulling the authority which the English Parliament had hitherto exercised in Ireland, and this was followed by 'confiscations and proscriptions on a gigantic scale.' The estates of absentee proprietors were transferred to the king. The greater part of the tithe was conveyed from the Protestant to the Roman Catholic clergy, no compensation being given to present incumbents; and by the

¹ Macaulay, iii. 191.

² *Ib.* p. 206.

repeal of the Act of Settlement many thousand square miles were transferred from English to Irish landlords.

Such a revolution in property, although hailed by the native Irish as the adjustment of long-standing wrongs, would have ruined all those who had of late purchased land in Ireland, and all the capitalists who during the last quarter of a century had planted and improved the soil.

The few Irish Protestants who adhered to James, and the nobles of Great Britain who had followed him into exile, implored him to restrain the violence of this rapacious assembly. No English Parliament, as they reminded him, would allow such laws to stand as were now passing through that of Ireland. But the chiefs of the old Irish families insisted that, if the king did not give back to them their inheritance, they would not take arms in defence of his title, and James yielded, although against his better judgment.¹ An attempt was made to supply the poverty of James's exchequer by the coinage of base money, and the Act of Complete Toleration, in which he took pride, was speedily followed by a sweeping Act of Attainder, which contained between two and three thousand names. These persons, if they did not surrender within a few months, were liable to forfeit their property and to be executed without trial. A persecution as cruel as that which the Protestants had undergone in France now raged in Ireland. The Protestant rulers of Dublin University had greeted James on his arrival at Dublin, but were now, without any accusation, turned out of their house, which was put to quite different uses.

His conduct in Ireland, and the measures to which he is said to have reluctantly consented, alienated numbers who had been inclined to advocate his cause, and the English fugitives awakened strong sympathy. The House of Commons ardently desired to send aid to the brave defenders of Londonderry, and rejoiced at the intelligence that an English army would be speedily despatched.

Meanwhile, the city being closed against the provisions sent to its relief, the brave defenders became increasingly distressed. The contest gave birth to feelings of implacable hatred. Within the walls were starvation and pestilence; without an enemy devoid of pity. Happily, however, on the last day of July, some English vessels succeeded in forcing their way up the river Foyle, and the starving garrison was relieved after a siege of a hundred and five days. The besieging army immediately retired.

¹ Macaulay, iii. 208-213.

The citizens of Londonderry received a letter of thanks from King William, for their loyalty and fortitude. A statue of the brave clergyman, George Walker, who had encouraged the citizens by his exhortations, still stands on a lofty pillar overlooking the river. Londonderry remains for the most part a Protestant city, and unhappily many of its inhabitants are still too much addicted to perpetuating party strife. The cry of 'No surrender!' and the toast of the 'immortal memory of King William' have been since that time degraded into the watchwords of hostile sects.¹

Scotland was also the scene of civil conflict, and more regard was shown to the local chiefs of the respective parties than to the constitutional change which had been effected in the government of Great Britain. The Convention-Parliament of Scotland, on proclaiming the accession of William and Mary, had passed an all but unanimous vote, and at the same time had urged the policy of abolishing prelacy.

Three commissioners, the Earl of Argyle, Sir James Montgomery, and Sir John Dalrymple, were appointed by the States to convey to the new king the allegiance of Scotland, and on May 11, William and Mary, surrounded by a splendid circle of noblemen, and in presence of numerous Scotsmen, entered into the covenant prescribed by the Scottish forms. At the last clause, by which the sovereign promised that he would root out all heretics and enemies of true religion, William paused. He had previously warned the commissioners that he would not take that part of the oath without explanation: 'I will not,' he now said, 'lay myself under any obligation to be a persecutor.' One of the commissioners declared that the oath had no such meaning, and, with this reservation, William concluded the engagement.² But jealousy of the House of Argyle prevailed extensively, and there was much dissension in the Highlands. Even before the proclamation of the new sovereigns, James had been assured of the favour with which he, as the descendant of their ancient kings, would be received in Scotland.

One of the last adherents who remained before his hasty departure from London was Lord Dundee, better known as the cruel Claverhouse, who mowed down the Covenanters at Bothwell Bridge. Dundee did not follow James in his flight, but was one of the crowd who greeted King William, from whom

¹ Lord Macaulay calls this 'the most memorable siege in the annals of the British Isles.' The garrison had been reduced from 7,000 to about 3,000 men, and it was computed that about 8,000 of the besieging army perished.—History, iii. 237.

² Macaulay, iii. 292.

he obtained a military escort; without it, indeed, he could not have safely reached the Highlands through the border counties, where his name was held in abhorrence.¹ When again in Scotland, Dundee received letters from James offering him the chance of a great military career, provided he could rally under the Stuart standard a sufficient number of clans. Knowing the necessity of more disciplined troops to oppose the regular army, Dundee begged James to send a few thousand soldiers from Ireland, with which force, together with the Highlanders, he hoped for success.

But James, however, disappointed his Scottish friends, sending only a few hundreds of ill-accounted Irish soldiers. Dundee attempted to supply the want of discipline by bravery, and at the pass of Killiecrankie succeeded in routing the troops of the government under General Mackay. But his own death in the engagement more than counterbalanced the victory, and the succeeding efforts of the government soon brought the civil war in Scotland to an end. The chiefs who had supported Dundee did not, indeed, swear allegiance to King William. They signed a paper declaring themselves still faithful subjects of King James, and promising renewed support to his cause; but on this they dispersed. On August 24, four weeks after Killiecrankie, the army which gained that victory had ceased to exist, as, forty years earlier, the army of Montrose had dispersed, not in consequence of a great defeat, but because from its mode of formation it could not be held together.² A chain of military forts was soon afterwards erected, which protected the agricultural Lowlanders from the predatory Highlanders. In Ireland the contest was still obstinate and bloody. Next to Londonderry, the principal stronghold of the English Protestants was Enniskillen; but, although the capital of a county, Enniskillen was at this time only a village consisting of about eighty dwellings, surrounding an ancient castle. When threatened by the Roman Catholic army its inhabitants summoned the Protestant gentry of the neighbourhood, and determined on self-defence. Situated on an island of Lough Erne, the place was the more easily defended; but after some months' resistance, it was determined at Dublin that Enniskillen should be attacked at once from several quarters. Colonel Wolseley approached on July 29, determining to raise the siege if possible, and a bloody battle was fought near the little town of Newton Butler, ending in complete victory for the Protestants. The butchery was terrible, the conquerors showing that ferocity

¹ Macaulay, iii. 269-270.

² Macaulay, iii. 377.

which has so frequently disgraced the civil wars of Ireland, and which has left permanent rancour behind it. Macaulay observes that in Scotland the old antipathy of race has been completely extinguished, and that a Lowlander can speak with pleasure of Highland prowess at Killiecrankie; but that 'the name of Newton Butler, insultingly repeated by a minority, is still hateful to the great majority of the population.'¹ The news of this Catholic defeat met the Irish army retreating from Londonderry, and occasioned much discomfiture to James, who was also disheartened by the news from Scotland. He is said to have thought of an immediate flight to the continent, but he remained to encounter total ruin from his great rival in person.

If William had not been assisted by foreign troops, his army would have been far from sufficient for the reduction of Ireland. The English army had been allowed to fall into neglect under Charles and James II., and the best of the English soldiers had been sent to Flanders.² There was a brigade of excellent Dutch troops, and four regiments were formed of the French Protestant refugees, commanded by Count Schomberg, a leading Protestant officer, who had resigned the position of Marshal of France, and gained in England a popularity not usually accorded to foreigners. William had given him the Order of the Garter and the title of duke, and when Schomberg was placed at the head of the army, the House of Commons presented him with £10,000 as a compensation for the sacrifices which he had made. The ceremonial, which took place in the House of Commons in July, 1689, when Schomberg took his place within the bar to return thanks for this donation, and to receive the commendation of the Speaker, was closely followed, a hundred and twenty-five years later, when, after the fall of Napoleon, the Duke of Wellington received through Parliament the thanks of the British nation.³

But the task allotted to Schomberg was full of difficulty. The recent successes of the supporters of King William, although damping the spirit of James, had little effect on his zealous Irish adherents, and when the general advanced from Ulster to Dublin, he passed through deserted towns and devastated fields to find some of his French soldiers in correspondence with the followers of James, and to encounter the evils of pestilence which followed the autumn rains.

¹ Macaulay, iii. 368.

² *Ib.* pp. 411-424.

³ *Ib.* p. 413. The reception of Schomberg was on his taking the command; that of Wellington at the end of his victorious campaign.

Schomberg succeeded in avoiding battle with troops which greatly outnumbered his own, and in November both armies retired to winter quarters. The news of the sufferings of the English army in Ireland occasioned great excitement in England. The House of Commons exonerated Schomberg from blame, but attributed the ravages of pestilence to the neglect and peculation of those charged with the supplies. The disease had generally spared those soldiers well supplied with clothing, but had swept away by thousands those who were ill-clad and who slept on the wet ground.¹ The public discontent was awhile suspended when the Rev. George Walker, the heroic defender of Londonderry, arrived in London. The public companies gave splendid entertainments in his honour, both the Universities offered him the degree of doctor of divinity, and the king presented him with £5,000, not, as he assured him, in payment for his services, but as a token of regard. Walker brought a petition to the House of Commons on behalf of the widows and families of those brave men who had fallen in the Irish war, and the House voted the sum of £10,000 to be dispensed among them. Dr. Walker was called before the House to be informed of this grant by the Speaker, to receive commendation for his conduct in the defence of the city, and to be assured that the Commons of England would always hold his name in grateful remembrance.²

The arrival in London during the same autumn of a very different visitor exhibited the abhorrence with which the great majority of Englishmen still regarded those who had been concerned in the execution of Charles I. Edmund Ludlow, the most illustrious surviving regicide, had resided since the Restoration quietly near the Lake of Geneva. He had refused to join in any of the plots which had been planned by the enemies of the House of Stuart; but, now that the last Stuart had been driven from the English throne, and the right of the people to resist oppression had been publicly proclaimed, Ludlow's friends, some of whom occupied, it is said, high public situations, invited his return and encouraged him to hope that he might be sent in high command to Ireland, where some of his old soldiers still cherished his name. But the experiment was attended with danger.

Although forty years had passed since Ludlow sat on the tribunal at Whitehall, and he returned from exile a greyheaded man in his seventieth year, the fatal signature could not be forgotten, and the Tory members of the House of Commons

¹ Macaulay, iii. 501.

² November 18 and 19, 1689.—Macaulay, iii. 505.

called on William to take measures for the apprehension of the traitor. Sufficient time was allowed him to effect his escape, and he again concealed himself in his Swiss retreat, which he never more quitted. Ludlow's tomb is in a church overlooking the little town of Vevey.¹

There were violent debates in the autumn of 1689 and the following spring. Distrusting the stability of the throne while war was still carried on by the adherents of the Stuart dynasty, the Whigs endeavoured to pass an 'Abjuration Bill,' enacting not only that everyone holding any kind of office must abjure the exiled king, but that any subject refusing to do so should be sent to prison.

William announced that he did not wish to impose upon his subjects a new test, and even a somewhat milder Act to the same effect was also quashed. Lord Wharton, a Puritan, who had fought for the Long Parliament, said in the House of Lords that he was a very old man, had lived through troubled times, had taken many oaths in his day, and was afraid that he had not kept them all. He could not consent to lay similar snares on the souls of others.²

In order to allay dissensions as far as possible, William proposed to Parliament an 'Act of Grace for Political Offences.' A few persons who were considered great criminals were excluded from the benefits of this healing measure. The recent appearance of Ludlow had shown the irreconcilable hostility of the majority against any surviving members of that High Court which had condemned King Charles; these were therefore excepted, as were also those two masked executioners, their names and rank still remaining unknown, who did the work on the scaffold at Whitehall. About thirty agents of James's tyranny were also left liable to punishment. Both Houses stood up uncovered to hear the reading of the Act of Grace, and gave their sanction to it without a dissentient voice. The firmness with which William withstood the importunity of his zealous adherents, refusing severe retaliation for past wrongs, risked his popularity with those who loved him best, but is now held by discriminating writers as one of his noblest titles to honour.³ The Act passed on May 20, and the king, before he

¹ Macaulay, iii. 506-509.

² Ib. pp. 571-575. The second Bill, 'still very severe,' was committed, but never reported.

³ Ib. iii. 575-579. One had been removed already by death who had never advocated pardon, and for whom very few would have besought mercy. Ever since that December night when Jeffreys's committal to the Tower saved him from the

prorogued Parliament, informed the members that it had become advisable for him to take the command of his forces in Ireland. An Act had been previously passed to provide that, whenever the king should leave England, the government should be left in the hands of Mary. It was in Ireland that the fate of the empire must now be decided, and nothing less than the firmness and ability of William himself appeared to be needed to prevent peculation and preserve discipline. At the end of January, Parliament was dissolved, and every part of the kingdom was excited by the coming election. For the first time, it is said, printed lists of the divisions in the House of Commons were circulated for the instruction of electors. The Whigs had been intemperate and vindictive, and a slight Tory majority in the Parliament, elected in March, 1690, bore witness to a reaction in the public mind. The king had endeavoured to restrain party violence, and many who had not shown themselves at St. James's since his accession went to kiss his Majesty's hand before he left England for the Irish campaign. But a dynasty cannot be displaced and a revolution effected without leaving the new government exposed to a host of enemies, and there were traitors in high places.

On the day before William left London he confided part of his anxiety and apprehensions to Dr. Burnet, Bishop of Salisbury, an earnest friend of Mary. The king spoke of the dangers which menaced England, owing to the violence of parties and the rancorous spirit of too many of the clergy. His heart was in the cause for which he was going to fight, and he felt himself far more able to conduct a campaign than to manage an English Parliament, but he sympathised with the position of his wife. It was, he said, hard on her that her father and her husband should be opposed to each other on the battle-field, and he recommended her to the bishop's especial care.¹ At this period, when communication by sailing vessels was so imperfectly carried on, the king's separation from his queen and kingdom was a very serious matter. A fortnight or three weeks sometimes passed before intelligence from London reached Dublin.

Scarcely had William left London when the queen and her council met to arrange measures for the defence of England against both foreign and domestic enemies.

A great French fleet, commanded by the Count of Tourville,

fury of the mob, he had remained a prisoner, and died there of disease, aggravated by drunkenness and misery, on April 18, 1689.

¹ Macaulay, iii. 600.

the ablest naval officer of France, entered the British Channel, and there was reason to apprehend that the English malcontents were kept apprised of its movements.¹

Lord Clarendon, brother-in-law of King James, and uncle of Queen Mary, was known to be deeply implicated in Jacobite plots of insurrection, but William, from regard to Mary's feelings, had included him in the Act of Grace. The time had become too full of peril for the proofs against him to be disregarded, and, with the queen's concurrence, a warrant was drawn up, by which Clarendon and several other known Jacobites were committed to the Tower.²

Lord Torrington, the English high admiral, had retreated before the French fleet towards the Straits of Dover, but, although the English force did not equal the French, the queen's council decided that they ought to offer battle. In consequence of this order, Torrington, who was off Beachy Head, prepared for action on June 30, placing the Dutch vessels in front, and determining that on their squadron should fall the greater danger. The Dutch fought with great bravery, but were ill-supported, and repulsed with great loss by the French. Torrington fled along the coast of Kent, and sought refuge in the Thames.

Great alarm was excited in London by the news of this defeat, which was considered most disgraceful. There was fear for the safety of Chatham, even of London itself.

The French army had just been victorious in Flanders, and it was apprehended that a large force might embark at Dunkirk, and that news would soon arrive of a great French invasion in Kent, and of a rising of the disaffected Jacobites in other counties. These fears agitated London during the first week of July, 1690. But, notwithstanding much disaffection to William's government, the Jacobites did not forget that they were Englishmen, and, although they little liked their Dutch allies, they had a greater hatred of the French. 'The danger of invasion was the best security against the danger of rebellion.'³

The lord mayor was summoned before the queen, and was requested to ascertain the means of defence. He reported to Whitehall that the citizens would support the government with their lives and fortunes; that the sum of £100,000 was ready to be paid into the exchequer; that 10,000 Londoners,

¹ Macaulay, iii. 604.

² *Ib.* 599-605.

³ Macaulay, iii. 610. The Bishop of Salisbury, who passed this summer at Windsor, relates that at this time of peril the queen showed extraordinary firmness and even cheerfulness before the world, although aware of the great danger.—Burnet's History, iv. 98.

well armed, were prepared for immediate service; and that six regiments of foot, a strong regiment of horse, and 1,000 dragoons should be provided immediately, without any expense to the crown.

Nor was this patriotic excitement confined to London. The rustics cheerfully repaired to the musters of the militia, and, now that a French invasion was hourly expected, the country gentlemen who held commissions signed by James committed them to the flames.

Lord Torrington, who would not have been safe at that moment in the streets of London, was sent to the Tower, and the queen sent a privy councillor to Holland with a letter to the States-General, in which she highly praised the valour of the Dutch seamen, and promised that the wounded Dutchmen should be tended with care.

During the three days succeeding the battle of Beachy Head, London remained in gloom and anxiety, but on July 5 a courier arrived bringing great news from Ireland.

William landed at Carrickfergus on June 14, and proceeded directly to Belfast. His arrival had been eagerly expected by the Protestants, and was soon announced to the enemy by the cannon from the signal-stations and by the blaze of bonfires. Within forty-eight hours after the king's landing, James left Dublin for the Irish camp on the northern boundary of Leinster. Both the rival kings were busily employed in collecting their forces. William, who well understood the art of war, enjoyed the active duties of a general, and showed a degree of cordiality among his troops which was wanting in his behaviour at court. Although his health was infirm, he was regardless of luxuries for his own accommodation, and slept during the campaign in the moveable wooden hut which he had brought from England.¹ Both princes were desirous of an engagement. William felt the necessity of reviving the hopes of his friends by prompt success; and James, who was somewhat restrained by his French general, Count Lauzun, would only retreat far enough to gain an advantageous battle-field. On June 30 both armies stopped their course at the valley of the Boyne. The flags of the House of Stuart and of their powerful Bourbon ally were waving together on the walls of Drogheda. It was reckoned that James, who was entrenched with the river at his front, had 30,000 men, about a third part of whom consisted of excellent French soldiers and brave Irish cavalry; the rest were of no account. Under the command of

¹ Macaulay, iii. 619.

William was an army of nearly 36,000 men, of whom about half were English, and the rest of various nations—Dutch, German, and French Huguenots. On the day before the battle, William, after reconnoitring the Irish position, when sitting on the river side for refreshment, was wounded in the arm by a shot from the opposite bank. The wound was bandaged and did not prevent the king from riding all day among his troops; but a report was spread that the hurt was serious. Mary was afflicted by the report, and Paris rejoiced on hearing that the mortal enemy of Louis had been struck dead by a cannon-ball within sight of both armies.¹ That false report was, however, soon followed by authentic news of William's great victory. On July 1 was fought the battle of the Boyne, a day never forgotten in Ireland. William's army was obliged to wade the river to reach the enemy. 'For a quarter of a mile the Boyne was alive with muskets and green boughs.' The Irish infantry proved cowards, but the cavalry strove hard to repulse the Huguenot regiments.

The brave old Schomberg quitted the position of a general to engage as a soldier, and was slain; so also was Dr. Walker, whom William had just appointed Bishop of Derry, and of whose personal share in the battle he heard with displeasure.² The loss of life on this important day was unusually small. About 1,500 Irish fell, who were almost all cavalry; on the other side only about 500 men, but among them was Schomberg, who was esteemed the first officer in Europe. It was immediately announced that the brave veteran should be interred in Westminster Abbey, and his corpse was embalmed and placed in a leaden coffin.

The news of the battle impending between her husband and father had been most afflicting to the queen. Withdrawing as much as possible from the bustle of the world, she wrote to her husband in terms of tender affection, enjoining that for her sake, as well as for his own, he would be careful that no personal harm should come to her father. Her natural tenderness proved superfluous, for James took ample care of his own safety. Soon after sunset on the fatal day, the vanquished king rode into Dublin Castle, escorted by two hundred cavalry. He was followed for many hours by the fugitive soldiers, and in early morning by the French regiments commanded by Lauzun, in still unbroken array.

¹ Macaulay, iii. 643.

² 'William,' says Macaulay, 'disapproved highly of gowmsmen taking part in battle' (iii. 626-638).

The lord mayor and some of the principal Roman Catholics of Dublin were summoned to the castle to hear the ex-king's last farewell. James lamented that in the course of two years he had been abandoned by two armies. His English troops, although brave, were disloyal; his Irish forces, although attached to his cause, had proved wanting in valour. After charging his adherents not to injure the city, which must soon fall into the hands of the English army, and advising them not to provoke the anger of the Prince of Orange—who had, however, never been accused of inhumanity—James took his departure with all speed, not stopping to rest till he was fifty miles from Dublin.¹ At sunrise on July 3 he arrived at the harbour of Waterford, went by sea to Kinsale, where he found a French frigate, in which he reached Brest on the ninth day after his defeat, and proceeded to St. Germain's, again to be the guest of the magnificent King of France. After the departure of James from Dublin, Tyrconnel and Lauzun collected their forces and left the city. The Protestants came forth from their places of concealment, and many Roman Catholics withdrew.

William fixed his head-quarters at Ferns, about two miles from Dublin, and on the morning of July 6 rode in state to the cathedral, to return thanks for his great victory. The Protestant magistrates again took office, but William declined to occupy the castle, and returned to sleep in the camp in his wooden cabin. It was in vain that James sought to induce Louis to send over an army to make an immediate descent upon England. The King of France, although kind and courteous, was not inclined so far to trust to James's assurances of his popularity in England, or of the dearth of soldiers in consequence of the Irish war. Meantime, Tourville, who, since the battle of Beachy Head, had been unopposed in the Channel, determined to test the truth of the assertion made in France by English Jacobites, that the people in England were ready to rally round an invading army. He landed a force and burned Teignmouth, at that time an obscure village. The inhabitants had fled; but sixteen or seventeen thousand Devonshire men had encamped near the shore, and aid was at hand from the neighbouring counties.

The whole nation was quickly astir. Mary reviewed large bodies of cavalry at Hounslow, and the militia of Kent and Surrey encamped at Blackheath.²

¹ Macaulay, iii. 641.

² Macaulay, iii. 652. Evelyn notes in his 'Diary' of August 3: 'The French landed

The French were anxious to get away; but, although their exploit proved both inglorious and ill-advised, a pompous description of the expedition appeared in the Paris 'Gazette.' A brief for the relief of the people of Teignmouth was read from the pulpits of all the parish churches in England.

The news that the French fleet threatened the shores of England disturbed William's rejoicing after his victory. He had resolved upon an immediate return, when he received the encouraging tidings of the departure of the French after they had so far brought injury on a defenceless village as to unite all parties against the allies of the ex-king. The queen wrote that Lord Marlborough, who was one of her private council, was of opinion that all danger of invasion was over for that year, and advised that five thousand troops should be sent to reduce Cork and Kinsale, important strongholds which were still occupied by the forces of James. William approved the plan and directed Marlborough to execute it.¹ Meanwhile himself he advanced towards Limerick, the second city of Ireland, in which Lauzun, Tyrconnel, and Sarsfield had taken refuge with the army routed at the Boyne. The French general despised the fortifications of the city, and saw no utility in offering a defence. Lauzun and Tyrconnel withdrew to Galway, and after a short time retired to France with the French forces. The great body of the Irish army, however, remained at Limerick, commanded by Boisseleau, a Frenchman, who had still some confidence in Irish valour, and by Sarsfield, who had shown great bravery at Londonderry.

Mingled feelings of patriotism and revenge determined the Irish to defend Limerick to the utmost. The French troops had scarcely departed when the army of William drew near, and the English anticipated an easy conquest. Sarsfield having obtained information that the English artillery had been left seven miles from the camp under weak protection, led a strong party of Irish through a wild tract, and succeeded in destroying nearly all the guns, which considerably delayed the attack. And, for the further encouragement of the native army, the chief of the O'Donnells, a descendant from petty Irish princes, who had been lately in the military service of Spain, contrived to arrive at Kinsale shortly after the departure of James, quickly gathered a large band

at Teignmouth, and burnt some poor houses. The French fleet still hovering about the western coast. The country in the West, all on their guard.' Macaulay refers to the 'London Gazettes' of July 24, 28, and 31.

¹ Macaulay, iii. 663.

of native followers, and made a pompous entrance into Limerick, where his appearance infused new life into the garrison.¹ The English stock of powder was beginning to fail, and the rains were bringing fever into the camp, when, on August 27, William ordered an assault to be made at a place where there was already a breach in the ramparts. The Irish fled into the town, followed impetuously by the English, and a terrible street-fight ensued. The explosion of a mine destroyed a fine German battalion. For four hours the struggle continued with great fierceness; the besiegers were compelled to retire to their camp, hoping for better success on the morrow, but their exhausted ammunition and the threatening rains induced William to raise the siege. He repaired to Waterford, entrusted the government of Ireland to three lords justices, the first of whom was Henry, now Lord Sidney, and sailed for England, arriving at Bristol on September 6. He was everywhere received with respect and joy. The attack made so lately by the French appeared to have reconciled even the most fanatical of English Jacobites to the existing government.

Lord Marlborough had already prepared to set off to Ireland, and on September 21 he entered Cork Harbour, and the city became an easy conquest. The siege of Kinsale followed, in which Marlborough was equally successful; but the dread of fever, to which the English constitutions were frequent victims during the autumnal rains of Ireland, now shortened the campaign, and five weeks after Marlborough's departure from Portsmouth he presented himself before his gratified sovereign at Kensington.² In Scotland, as well as in Ireland, the aspect of affairs had become more favourable. The long contest between two forms of ecclesiastical government had been concluded, in the only way compatible with the peace of Scotland, by the establishment of Presbyterianism; but the king was dissatisfied that this Act was not accompanied by another to allow those who did not approve of Presbyterian worship freely to hold their own religious assemblies.³ In a letter to his Scottish commissioner William enjoined moderation, and the Assembly assured his Majesty in reply that they

¹ Macaulay, iii. 671-673.

² Macaulay, iii. 681.

³ The compromise by which Presbyterianism was established was attended by much difficulty, and James and his queen wrote despatches hoping to obtain the support of the Puritans whom he had used so ill. There were still some zealous Covenanters who declared that Dutch Presbyterianism would not do for Scotland, and who were as averse as the extreme prelatists in England to take the oath of allegiance to William and Mary.—Macaulay, iii. 681-695, 703-707.

had suffered too much from oppression ever to be oppressors themselves.

Lord Torrington, who had remained in the Tower on account of his conduct in the Channel, was sent early in December to a court-martial at Sheerness, a measure to which the House of Lords consented with difficulty. After a trial which lasted three days, he was acquitted, returned to the House of Lords, and even ventured to present himself at court. But most of the peers looked coldly on him, and William showed marked disapproval of his conduct.

Since the detection of the Jacobite plot, immediately after the king's departure for Ireland, the disaffected party had sunk into obscurity. At the time when Tourville's fleet assaulted the coast of Devonshire, it was apprehended that the Non-juring bishops might willingly sanction an invasion; to refute this charge they issued a declaration that they had no correspondence with France, and would rather shed their blood than see England subjugated by that foreign king who had so cruelly persecuted their fellow-Protestants in his own dominions.

The Non-juring bishops had been treated by William with great lenity. He did not forget the memorable petition of the seven bishops so strongly opposed to the innovations of James, even when they refused to subscribe a declaration of obedience to himself, and those who were deprived of their benefices were allowed to remain for a year in their old residences. Only a few months, however, elapsed before the discovery of a treasonable plot, the principal conspirators in which were Turner, Bishop of Ely, Lord Preston, a Scottish nobleman long resident in France, Lord Clarendon, who had lately fallen under the suspicion of the government, and Lord Dartmouth, late commander of the fleet under James. This man had lately professed allegiance to William, but was now designing to betray Portsmouth to the French.

The adherents of the late monarch felt the great difficulty of their situation. The natural enmity of the English towards any foreign invaders had been increased by the burning of Teignmouth. The English were also for the most part Protestants, and Louis XIV., the strong ally without whose aid James was powerless to invade England, was a bitter persecutor of Protestants. Lord Preston was desired to convey to St. Germain's the resolution of the English Jacobites, viz., to urge that no attempt to restore the late government could succeed unless in perfect accord with the Church of England,

and accompanied by a promise to carry on the administration according to Parliamentary law.

It was at midnight on the last day of the year 1690 that Preston and two coadjutors went on board a small vessel near the Tower to fulfil their mission. Fortunately the owner of the vessel had awakened the suspicions of Earl Caermarthen, president of the council, who sent his son, Lord Danby, in a yacht to pursue the adventurers. Their vessel was stopped and their papers seized. Among the latter were letters from Bishop Turner to James and his queen, slightly disguised in phrase, but quite intelligible, speaking also in the name of Sancroft, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and of other Non-juring prelates; with these were the heads of a declaration which the conspirators recommended James to publish as soon as he should land in England.¹

The knowledge which spread through London that the treason had been detected and the messengers arrested by the lord president gave rise to a renewed demonstration of attachment to the king. On January 5, William dismissed Parliament with thanks for their support and hopes for the future. On the 18th he embarked for Holland, attended by a splendid train of noblemen, to meet the princes of Germany, who, with those of Spain, Poland, and Savoy, assembled at the Hague to form a confederation against the encroaching ambition of Louis XIV.

After an unusually perilous voyage, William was received in his native country with exultation. He had taken leave of the States-General two years before in deep anxiety; he now returned the King of Great Britain, to take the lead in the greatest coalition which had been formed in Europe for a hundred and eighty years.²

There was a long train of German sovereign princes, but as yet no King of Prussia, a title which was assumed a few years later by the ambitious Frederick, Elector of Brandenburg. Enmity to Louis XIV. was not confined to the Protestant powers. By refusing to allow the bishops to yield implicit obedience to the see of Rome, Louis had also brought down on himself the anger of successive Popes.

¹ Macaulay, iii. 724-725.

² Macaulay, iv. 6. The rapid progress of the reformed doctrines among the minor princes and the free cities of Germany had led to the adoption of the word 'Protestantism,' and to the formation of the Germanic Confederation, called the League of Smalkald, in 1530. Charles V. was compelled in 1552 to sign a treaty with the Protestant princes of Germany, allowing them the free exercise of their religion.

But William never forgot that his great mission was the protection of the reformed faith, and he continually interceded with his Roman Catholic allies in favour of their Protestant subjects. The poor shepherds of the Waldenses, long cruelly persecuted, became in the spring of 1691 free to worship according to their consciences. Prisoners for heresy were discharged, and children who had been taken from their parents were restored; and although these simple mountaineers probably never knew who was their benefactor, these blessings were the consequence of William's discussions at the Hague with the Duke of Savoy.¹

The war of the allies was not against France as a nation, but against the despotic ruler who stifled all independent feeling in the country which he dazzled by the splendour of his victories.² No sooner had the associated princes left the Hague than Louis brought up large forces to besiege the town of Mons, one of the most important fortresses which protected the Spanish Netherlands; and, in spite of William's efforts, it capitulated. Louis returned in April in triumph to Versailles, and William's presence was required in England. Ashton, one of the confederates in the late plot, and on whose person the treasonable papers were found, had been already executed. The fate of Lord Preston was still in suspense. He had confessed his guilt, and named Lords Clarendon and Dartmouth, the Bishop of Ely, and William Penn as his accomplices. After having been liberated, Lord Preston was again arrested on fresh suspicions, but was at last allowed to retire to a lonely residence in Yorkshire. Lord Clarendon, after being confined for six months in the Tower, was, out of regard to his relationship to the queen, permitted to withdraw into country life. Lord Dartmouth, guilty of the highest treason in having offered his assistance in a French invasion of England, died in the Tower, of apoplexy. The Bishop of Ely and William Penn both succeeded in effecting their escape to France.

The news of the fall of Mons spread joy among the Jacobites in England. The Non-juring bishops had been treated with great lenity, but their ill-will towards the new government had been plainly shown by the intercepted correspondence, and it was now requisite to fill the vacant sees. Dr. Tillotson was made Primate. Although a mild man and much beloved by the

¹ Macaulay, iv. 12.

² See an article in the '*Revue des Deux Mondes*,' February 15, 1861, '*La Nationalité Bretonne*.' The expenses of the war which Louis conducted against this coalition occasioned financial difficulties which prepared for the French Revolution of the following century.

citizens, he was assailed by the Jacobites with the bitterest invectives.

Sancroft, the late archbishop, after trying as long as possible to retain possession of Lambeth Palace, retired to his estate in Suffolk, still full of anger at the changes in Church and State.¹

In the following May, William returned to the continent to resume his part in the campaign; but the most serious events for the English government were those now occurring in Ireland. The whole province of Connaught, the greater part of Munster, and two or three counties of Leinster, still acknowledged no sovereign but King James. William and Mary had been proclaimed at Dublin in November, and trade and industry had already begun to revive within the territories which admitted the English rule, but in that part of Ireland which maintained its opposition there could hardly be said to be either law or property. Limerick and Galway, which were the only considerable towns on the western coast, had become lawless nests of pirates. Limerick was suffering from a scarcity of food when, in the spring, it was relieved by the arrival of Saint Ruth, a distinguished French general, who took the command of the Irish forces, and brought a welcome supply of provisions.²

General Ginkell, a Dutch officer in King William's service, took the command of the English forces, and, after having obtained possession of Athlone, defeated the Irish army in a bloody engagement at Aghrim, and induced Galway to surrender. Limerick remained the last asylum of the vanquished Irish, and when, in the middle of August, Ginkell encamped before that city on the same ground occupied by William twelve months before, but only to meet defiance from a garrison which nearly equalled his own army in strength, he felt a natural apprehension lest, after the autumnal rains, sickness might a second time prove a more dangerous enemy than the artillery on the ramparts.

The siege was hotly pressed, and before the end of September there appeared to be no safety for the inhabitants except in capitulation. The first terms proposed to the besiegers included claims which England was as yet totally unprepared to grant. Willingly as the English now acquiesce in the propriety of allowing to every parish its priest, to the towns municipal privi-

¹ Respecting the conduct of the principal Non-juring clergy, see Hallam, ii. 292, and note. Macaulay marks favourably the conduct of Bishop Ken, of Bath and Wells (iv. 40).

² Macaulay, iv. 78.

leges and perfect freedom from all disabilities on account of religion, such stipulations appeared to the most liberal English Protestant of the seventeenth century unconstitutional and extravagant.

But whilst the articles of capitulation were in preparation, friendly meetings took place among the officers from both sides. A question concerning the bravery of the Irish troops is said to have drawn from the brave Sarsfield, commander of the Irish army, the declaration that, if the kings could have been exchanged, he would willingly try the chances of the battle-field again.¹ On October 3, two treaties were signed, the one military, the other civil.

According to the first, which was subscribed by the generals, the Irish were allowed to remain under the command of their officers, and a considerable number of transports were promised for the conveyance of those who desired to go to France. Part only of Limerick was to be delivered up to the English.

By the civil treaty, in which two lords-justices took part, it was promised that the Irish Roman Catholics should enjoy the same privileges as in the reign of Charles II., and an entire amnesty was promised to all the inhabitants who would take the oath of allegiance to King William. The complete indemnity for any treason or misdemeanours committed since the accession of James, which it was desired to guarantee, was more than the lords-justices felt able to insure, but they declared that the government would endeavour to obtain the ratification of the treaty by Parliament.²

General Sarsfield had resolved to enter the French service, and was desirous to take with him to the continent a considerable force. Ginkell was as naturally unwilling to send a large reinforcement to the army of Louis XIV.

The Roman Catholic priests urged emigration, and stigmatised the service of a sovereign whom they called a usurper and a heretic. Ginkell, on the other hand, issued proclamations encouraging the Irish to live happily at home, and, should they prefer a military life, to enrol themselves in the service of King William. The 14,000 infantry who had formed the garrison of defence were drawn up in a large meadow near the city; those who determined to remain in Ireland were directed to file off at a certain spot, those who passed on were

¹ 'Sarsfield,' says Macaulay, 'was doubtless thinking of the day on which he had seen the two sovereigns at the head of two great armies, William foremost in the charge, and James foremost in the flight' (iv. 104).

² Macaulay, iv. 106.

to be considered destined for France. The rival generals looked on with painful interest. When the long procession had all passed, it was computed that about 1,000 men agreed to enter William's service, and about 2,000 accepted passes from Ginkell and went quietly home.

But about 11,000 determined to embark with Sarsfield, and to these were added most of the Irish cavalry.¹ Sarsfield did not, however, succeed in leading all these thousands to the place of embarkation. Some of the Irish dreaded the prospect of exile, and still clung to the humble cabins which had been their home. The troops had to march for four days before going on board the vessels which awaited them at Cork, and the desertions were numerous. Room had been found on board the ships for the families of many soldiers, but a great multitude of women and children remained on the shore lamenting the separation, and some of the victorious Protestants could not hear without a pang of sympathy the terrible wail uttered by the most defenceless of the poor Irish. Before the last ship had left the shore, news came from France that the first who sailed had been ungraciously received at Brest, were scantily fed and provided, and these reports caused hundreds who had intended to emigrate to return to their villages.²

When William opened Parliament in October, congratulations were expressed by him on the pacification of Ireland, and that the English Channel was no longer molested by the French fleet. The supplies required for the continuance of the war were readily granted. Discussions took place concerning the articles of the treaty of Limerick, 'which were conceded,' says Hallam, 'by the noble-minded conqueror against the disposition of those who longed to plunder and persecute their fallen enemy.' The Commons proposed to exclude Irish Roman Catholics from all offices of public trust, and wished even to prohibit them from practising law or medicine; but it was argued with success that to enforce such restrictions would decidedly infringe that immunity of the Roman Catholic worship which the treaty guaranteed. The Lords do not appear to have been more inclined than the Commons to favour the Irish, but they were more careful not to commit a breach of a positive compact. From this time, till the passing of the Roman Catholic Emancipation Act in 1829, no Roman Catholic was allowed to sit in Parliament.³

¹ Macaulay, iv. 108-110.

² Macaulay, iv. 111.

³ See, concerning this discussion, Macaulay, iv. 123, and Hallam, ii. 560.

The Highlands of Scotland, at this period far distant from England in respect of the transmission of intelligence, and still farther behind in civilisation, continued, for some time after William's accession, in communication with the exiled king. Early in 1691, James sent from France a small donation to the rebel chiefs of that wild country, declaring his inability to give them more support, and counselling them for the present to make peace with the government.

The rebellion in which the Highland chiefs were engaged was, in fact, a local strife against two chiefs—MacCallum More, the powerful Marquis of Argyle, and the Earl of Breadalbane, head of a younger branch of Campbells, both of whom had been commissioned by William to dispense the sum of about £15,000 in the work of quieting the Highlands and settling terms of allegiance with the chiefs. A free pardon was offered to all who would come to an appointed place to subscribe the conditions before the last day of December, 1691, after which all defaulters would be considered guilty of treason. Several Highland clans immediately submitted, and flocked to take the oaths in presence of the sheriff. The last to do so, unhappily for himself and his tribe, was Macdonald of Glencoe, called MacIan, the chief of a small clan in Argyleshire, who, dwelling in an almost inaccessible fortress, had hitherto defied the government, and by allowing his men to pillage the more fertile lands of the Campbells, had gained the deadly hatred of the Earl of Breadalbane and the Marquis of Argyle. After long hesitation MacIan determined on submission, and went to Fort William on the very last day named, to take the oaths. Unfortunately, no magistrate was then in attendance. Bearing a letter from the governor of the fort, MacIan at length sought the sheriff at Inverary, but he was old, and snowstorms had made the way difficult; he did not arrive till January 6, when, from his want of punctuality, he was compelled to seek as a favour what he might before have claimed as a right. The sheriff, however, granted all the protection in his power, and registered his oath. But MacIan's enemies, Sir John Dalrymple, the Secretary of State in Scotland, and the Earl of Breadalbane, found means to suppress the certificate which was sent to Edinburgh, on the plea of irregularity, and to misrepresent the case to the king. William, who was prepared to inflict severities on those clansmen described as lawless and obstinate rebels, was induced to sign an order directed to the commander of the Scottish forces, to the effect that if MacIan of Glencoe and his tribe could be well distinguished from the other Highlanders, 'it would be

proper, for the vindication of public justice, to extirpate that set of thieves.' The fact that MacIan had taken his oath of allegiance was concealed from the king. Armed with this deadly instrument, Dalrymple and Breadalbane resolved upon a plan of exercising their vindictive cruelty by treachery, of which only the most ferocious savages might have been deemed capable.

On February 1, a hundred and twenty soldiers of Argyle's regiment, commanded by Colonel Campbell, entered the valley of Glencoe. The eldest son of the chief advanced, asking with anxiety the object of this intrusion. It was replied that lodging only was required for the troop. The Campbells were received with hospitality, and were regaled for twelve days, apparently with good will on both sides. But it had been planned that Colonel Hamilton should arrive on the 13th with a force of four hundred men, and that after all means of escape had been stopped, a general massacre of all the Macdonalds should ensue. The kindness and cordiality with which the Campbells had been received had not softened the hearts of those concerned in this vile act of treachery. The coming of the Hamiltons was not even waited for, and at five o'clock on that fatal morning the massacre began. It was easy work to shoot down unsuspecting men. MacIan and his wife fell, but their sons, roused from sleep by faithful servants, were able to escape, and in spite of the precautions taken by the aggressors, there were many fugitives, although some of them afterwards perished of cold and starvation. Those of the clan who ventured to return after the destroyers had left the valley, found their huts burnt and their cattle, sheep, and goats driven away. The news of this dreadful massacre spread horror and indignation everywhere.

Highland chiefs, believing that they could no longer depend on the faith of treaties, joined the fugitives from Glencoe, and would have formed an armed confederacy for their defence, had not the offenders shortly afterwards left the Highland districts.

The government council at Edinburgh, recoiling from the indignation which this enormity had provoked, granted permission to several persons included in the general capitulation, to stay at home even without taking the oaths of allegiance. Parliamentary investigation was deferred nearly three years by the influence of the party in power, but in 1695 the act was voted at Edinburgh to have been murder.¹ This declaration

¹ See 'Memoirs of Campbell of Lochiel,' p. 324.

was made by a committee directed by the king to inquire into the case, and by whom the eldest son of Maclean and other fugitives were examined. Difficulty was felt in determining the degree of guilt of the Master of Stair. His punishment was left to the king, and William inflicted on Dalrymple no other punishment than dismissal from office. That so guilty an act of cruelty was thus lightly passed over has been considered as a blemish on the fame of William by a historian always desirous to praise him.¹ Although the guilt of Captain Campbell, called Glenlyon, and his followers might not be within the scope of the law's vengeance after the orders they had received, they could not altogether stifle the feeling of remorse, and it was said that Glenlyon was perpetually haunted by remembrance of the horrors of Glencoe.²

In England the affair was not mentioned for some months in the newspapers, and it appears to have been unnoticed in private letters. When, at length, it was made known that some of the clan Macdonald had been surprised and slain by a detachment of Argyle's soldiers, little attention was paid to an instance of severe vengeance dealt upon those who were considered as wild mountaineers who constantly violated the laws. The king was at this time much troubled by reports of Marlborough's disloyalty. That nobleman had from time to time communicated with the court at St. Germain's, and was now at work encouraging the antipathy of the English for the Dutch, in order to make a serious breach between the King and the Parliament. The extent of William's knowledge concerning this plot is even now imperfectly known, but Marlborough was suddenly dismissed from all his offices, early in January, 1692, and the Princess Anne, who persisted in continuing on intimate terms with the earl and countess, fell under the royal displeasure.

When, early in March, William, as usual, departed to the continent, he left this country exposed to peculiar dangers. The French government had made great preparations for attempting another expedition to place James upon the throne. A camp was formed on the coast of Normandy for all the Irish regiments which had entered the French service, who were to be joined by 10,000 French troops, commanded by a French marshal, and a noble fleet was provided to convey this force to the shores of England.³ James hoped that the fleet prepared for this invasion would be ready before his scheme was antici-

¹ Macaulay, iv. 580. See also, at page 199, description of the character and supposed motives of Dalrymple, 'Master of Stair.'

² *Ib.* 217.

³ Macaulay, iv. 220.

pated; he even hoped that in the English navy he had more friends than enemies, and that Admiral Russell, who would command, might be inclined to favour him. Although the landing of French troops at Teignmouth had, two years before, united all parties in resistance, James now flattered himself that if he could land he should soon become the master of England. He published a declaration which was speedily dispersed over the kingdom, but which by its threats of vengeance roused general indignation.

He published a list of those who could not expect mercy, among whom were Ormond, and Bishops Tillotson and Burnet, and did not even forget the insults which had been offered him, when a fugitive king, by the poor rustics at Sheerness. The near prospect of an invasion, and this ungracious declaration of hostility towards many of his former subjects, rescued Russell from Jacobitism. He had wished to serve James, but he could not allow the French to triumph over England.¹ The alarm in England was, however, greatly increased by the belief that some men in high places were traitors, and accusations were brought before the ministers implicating Marlborough as well as other noblemen, besides Bishops Sancroft and Sprat. Marlborough was sent to the Tower, but afterwards liberated, owing to the turpitude of his accusers.² Vigorous preparations had been meantime made for the defence of England. A great camp was formed near Portsmouth, and the regiments of London and Westminster, together forming a body of 13,000 soldiers, were reviewed before the queen in Hyde Park. William hastened the naval preparations of Holland, and in the second week of May an armament hitherto unsurpassed appeared in the British Channel, manned by the finest seamen of the two maritime nations, and was placed under the chief command of Russell. But alarming rumours were in circulation concerning the fidelity of many of the officers. After much painful doubt, Mary resolved to appeal to the honour of those to whose skill the safety of the country was confided.

On May 15, a great number of officers assembled on board the admiral's ship to hear a letter read by Russell from the Secretary of State, stating that the queen had heard that stories were in circulation very injurious to the character of the navy, but that her Majesty was determined not to believe such

¹ Macaulay, iv. 232. The declaration which James issued was felt to be so impolitic that 'the wiser of his partisans in England were willing to insinuate that it was not authentic.'—Hallam, ii. 291.

² Macaulay, iv. 253. 'It is now certain,' says Lord Macaulay, 'that the government possessed moral proofs of his guilt,' but Robert Young was a false accuser.

accusations, and assured the gentlemen who had been thus accused that she fully relied upon their honour. The result was most satisfactory, and the officers eagerly signed an address assuring the queen that they would resolutely venture their lives in defence of her rights, of English freedom, and of the Protestant faith, against all foreign and Popish invaders. A few hours after this assurance, Tourville's squadron hove in sight of Dorsetshire, as he drew towards La Hogue, where the army of invasion was already beginning to embark. On the morning of May 19 a hard-fought battle took place between the hostile fleets. The roar of the guns was distinctly heard at twenty miles' distance by the army encamped on the coast of Normandy. At length the French fleet was scattered, and Russell, with the greater part of his ships, blockaded the bay of La Hogue. After a short delay he succeeded in setting the French vessels on fire, and at the ebb of tide the victorious English flotilla slowly retired, chanting in thundering strain the national anthem, while James and the French generals looked on in helpless consternation.

The battle, which had been carried on during five days over a wide extent of shore, was called, from the scene of this last action, the battle of La Hogue.¹ The news of this victory was received in London with great exultation; even the more respectable Non-jurors were well satisfied that the national enemy had suffered a repulse. William was defeated in the Netherlands at Steinkirk soon afterwards, and his military renown was partially eclipsed by the fame of the Duke of Luxemburg, the general of Louis XIV. The awe with which William was regarded abroad as the chief of the coalition was proved by the discovery of a base plan for his assassination, which had been concerted at the French War Office and entrusted to an officer named Grandval. This man's associates betrayed him, and about a week after the battle of Steinkirk, Grandval was brought before a court-martial of British officers, and executed as a traitor. William forbade the use of torture to obtain the names of his employers, although it was in such cases customary in the Netherlands. There was reason to believe that both James and Louis had sanctioned the attempt.²

When William returned to England in October his recep-

¹ Macaulay, iv. 240. Great exertions were made in London for the relief of the wounded. The only hospitals then existing were St. Thomas's and St. Bartholomew's. The queen directed in her husband's name that the palace which had been begun by Charles II. at Greenwich should be completed and converted into an asylum for wounded seamen.

² Ib. 285-287.

tion was cordial, although it had been a season of much misfortune. Port Royal, the capital of Jamaica, at that time the wealthiest city founded by the English beyond the Atlantic, had been destroyed by an earthquake with the loss of 1,500 of its inhabitants. The general failure of the harvest affected all classes, though less in England than in France. The gangs of burglars and highwaymen which beset the outskirts of London spread so much consternation that it was thought expedient to employ soldiers to repress them. It was amidst discontent and distress that the king opened Parliament, and, after warmly praising the tried valour of his subjects, urged the need of still further sacrifices, that the war which he judged so essential to the safety of England and Protestantism might be maintained with adequate vigour.

James, after beholding at La Hogue the destruction of that French fleet by which he had hoped to regain his throne, returned to the palace of St. Germain's, accorded him by the hospitality of Louis, where he still feigned to appoint secretaries of state and to keep up the semblance of a court. But Louis was at length feeling heavily the ill-effects of continued war, and began to wish for some limit to its sacrifices. Surely, he thought, it was impolitic in James, considering the Protestantism of England, to confine his friendship to Roman Catholics, and to hold out no promises, in case of his restoration, to members of the Established Church. It was intimated accordingly to James by his best friends that he ought to offer concessions, and he very unwillingly issued a new declaration, promising when he should land in England to call a Parliament and confirm all the laws which it might propose, to protect the rights and privileges of the Protestant Church, and not again to violate the Test Act. His insincerity in these concessions is proved by a letter to the Pope, sent by his secretary, ending with the words, 'After all, the object of this declaration is to get back to England; we shall fight the battle of the Catholics with much greater advantage at Whitehall.'¹

The times were greatly changed from those when such a proclamation would have conciliated the rival parties. The King of France determined to make another great effort to crush the coalition, but he left to the brave Marshal Luxemburg the honour of leading the French forces against the allies. William, who had been for some time at his post in Brabant, carefully watching the movements of the enemy, was suddenly alarmed, on July 18, by hearing that the French general was

¹ Macaulay, iv. 386-391.

close at hand with nearly 80,000 men, to whom he could only oppose 50,000.

The battle, disastrous for the allies, which ensued was named from the little stream of Landen. The large numbers of the French were aided by the formidable body called 'the household troops of Louis,' the most renowned combatants in Europe, led by young princes and lords who made warfare their delight and pride. But even this far-famed band was shaken by the King of England's onslaught. Too feeble to bear the encumbrance of a cuirass, William yet disdained to conceal the brilliant star towards which his own troops might rally. When he found it necessary to retreat, the conquerors were too weary for pursuit, and he soon collected his scattered forces near Louvain. More than 10,000 of the best French troops are said to have fallen at this, 'the most sanguinary battle fought in Europe during the seventeenth century.'¹ Before the evil news could reach England, a great calamity had occasioned universal distress. The principal part of the Smyrna fleet, which had been for many months accumulating in the Thames and the Texel, was lost. Of the five hundred vessels under the convoy of English and Dutch men-of-war, which left the English coast in June, carrying a more valuable freight than had ever put to sea before, nearly half the number perished or were taken by the French. The gain to France was apparently not great, but the loss to England and Holland was immense. Great was the agitation in London, and an address from the merchants was carried to the queen, who presided at the council board, upon which she directed Lord Keeper Somers to explain her desire to give assistance, and to inform them that she had already appointed an investigation which might prevent the recurrence of a similar misfortune. This reply caused general satisfaction, and the lord mayor attended at the palace to thank the queen for her goodness, to assure her that London would be true to her and the king under all vicissitudes, and that the Common Council had unanimously resolved to advance any sums necessary for the support of the government.²

The expenses of the continental war having exhausted the revenue more than it could be replenished by taxation, the project of the national debt was suggested, an expedient which had long been employed on the continent. The riches of England had much increased since the time of the Restoration, and many persons found difficulty in profitably investing their surplus income. Hoarding, although known to be un-

¹ Macaulay, iv. 404-413.

² *Ib.* 413-416.

productive and unsafe, was very general. It is said that Mr. Pope, father of the poet, who retired from business about the year 1688, carried into the country nearly twenty thousand pounds, which he stored in his strong-box, taking from it what he required for his maintenance. Considerable sums of gold and silver were frequently concealed behind wainscot or in secret drawers. Companies allured capitalists by the promise of large profits, but frequently occasioned their ruin. When, therefore, towards the close of 1692, it was proposed by the government to raise a loan of a million, for which the state would, following the example of Holland, pay regular interest, the plan was well received.¹ The tendency of the scheme was to encourage loyalty to the government, as in case of another revolution both the principal and interest would be endangered. Accordingly, in a few months the Bank of England commenced business. Private banking-houses had for many years existed in London, but payments of coin were usually made at the shops of the goldsmiths. The great European banks were at Genoa, which had been able to preserve its deposits inviolate for nearly three centuries, and at Amsterdam. The Great Seal was affixed to the charter of the Bank of England in June, 1694, and the corporation which has since become so powerful began business in the hall of the Grocers' Company.²

In the summer of 1694 a change in the French policy induced William to despatch an expedition to Brest, which failed, however, owing to a premature disclosure of its destination. It is now known that the failure of the enterprise was occasioned by Marlborough's treachery, who secretly warned James, and he directly conveyed the news to the King of France.

Adverse gales detained the English fleet for some weeks in the Channel, and before the ships could reach Brest every possible preparation had been made to repel the attack, under the direction of the great French engineer, Vauban. The deaths of the brave English commander and of more than a thousand British seamen and soldiers were the result.³ Yet, although Marlborough rendered this service to the Jacobite cause, his object is said to have been more to regain consideration with the

¹ Macaulay, iv. 320-326. The first rate of interest promised was ten per cent., to be reduced to seven in 1700.

² *Ib.* 502.

³ *Ib.* 508-513. See also a long note in Hallam's 'Constitutional History,' vol. ii. 'He,' Marlborough, 'communicated to the court of St. Germain's, and through that to the court of Versailles, the secret of an expedition, which failed in consequence, with the loss of the commander and eight hundred men' (p. 288).

English government than to serve the banished king. Talmash, the commander, exclaimed with his dying breath that he was the victim of treachery; but it was not till after the discovery of the Stuart papers that Marlborough's treachery was known as a fact.¹

Towards the end of this year, the small-pox spread its ravages in London. No safeguard had been then discovered to moderate its violence, and it attacked the queen. When Mary became aware of the deadly nature of her illness, she dismissed from the palace all the ladies and servants who had not had the disease, and calmly prepared for the fatal end. Her husband was her close attendant, except for short intervals of rest. William's camp-bed was prepared in the antechamber, but his usual place was in his wife's sick-room. His grief at her death was very great, and there were few who did not mourn the loss of a queen whose kind, charitable heart and winning manners had exercised so benign an influence. Evelyn, although at first opposed to a queen who occupied her father's throne, was won over by her who 'never,' as he said, 'inquired of what opinion persons were who were objects of charity,' and declared that there 'never had been so universal a mourning.'² The funeral was in every respect a rare occasion. In no case, excepting when the deceased sovereign was the partner of the throne, could the Parliament survive the sovereign. The Lords in their scarlet robes, and the Commons clad in long black mantles, followed the hearse to Westminster Abbey. William wisely determined that the execution of Mary's wish that the palace of Greenwich should be converted into an asylum for seamen would be the best monument to her honour. An inscription on the hall testified that the design originated with Mary, and, had the whole been completed during the king's life, her statue would have been placed in the court.³ The people of Holland, and the persecuted Protestants throughout Europe, mourned for Mary; but her father forbade mourning to be worn at his petty court.

Among statutes of temporary significance which received the attention of Parliament was that which subjected the press to the control of licensers. This restriction the Commons

¹ Macaulay, iv. 512.

² 'Evelyn's Diary,' iii. A Scotsman, who was a friend of the Stuarts, declared that Mary was naturally a good princess, and 'had a warm side for her father's friends.' He relates a case in which she ventured to interpose in favour of Sir John M'Lean, and William paid immediate attention to her appeal, but the object proved unworthy.—'Memoirs of Lochiel,' p. 325.

³ Macaulay, p. 535.

wished to remove, not so much for the great principle which Milton had long before upheld, as on account of the inconvenience to publishers of a law which made it penal to open a box of books from abroad except in the presence of a censor of the press. By the repeal of this restriction, English literature was emancipated from the control of the government.¹ Less attention was bestowed upon the change than it deserved, for before it took place there had been, properly speaking, no newspapers in England, except the 'London Gazette' issued under the direction of the secretary of state. The coffee-houses of London chiefly supplied the craving for general news. Not more than a fortnight, however, after the restraint had been removed a newspaper entitled 'Intelligence Domestic and Foreign' came out, and it was speedily followed by others, although only on two days of the week.

These papers were small, and printed on paper which would now be thought scarcely good enough for street-ballads, but they sometimes contained writing which was not contemptible, and they were all on the side of the king and the Revolution. The judges had in the reign of Charles II. made it criminal to publish political intelligence without a royal licence. It was still doubtful how far the law justified that act, and this doubt tended to make journalists cautious.²

The newspapers had now good news to communicate. As usual, William spent the summer of 1695 in the Netherlands, and he had resolved if possible to regain Namur, which the French had strongly fortified since it became their possession three years previously. He was supported by the Elector of Bavaria. Marshal Villeroy, at the head of 80,000 men, attempted in vain to raise the siege; after great slaughter the citadel capitulated, and, for the first time, according to popular belief, since a French officer had held the rank of marshal, a marshal of France delivered up a fortress to a victorious enemy. Intense anxiety was felt during the siege both in Paris and London, and all the allies testified their joy, the Dutch by striking medals, the Spaniards by singing the 'Te Deum.' The satisfaction felt in England was the greater because such success was unusual. For centuries England had done little more than supply her continental allies with small bands of brave soldiers. From the day of July, 1453, on which 'the two brave Talbots,' the Earl of Shrewsbury and his son, fell in the vain attempt to reconquer Guienne, till William III.

¹ Macaulay, iv. 348.

² *Ib.* p. 603.

headed the confederation, Englishmen had borne no principal part in continental war.¹

When the king returned to England in October his reception was very cordial. Before the approaching general election he resolved to show himself to the people in parts of the country which he had not visited, and went first to Newmarket, which, in the autumn, at this period, was the gayest place in England and frequently resorted to by the whole court. After visiting several country seats and receiving addresses, he reached Nottingham, and hunted several times in Sherwood Forest, where Robin Hood had formerly found shelter with his train of outlaws. At Warwick Castle, the finest specimen remaining of a feudal residence, there were illuminations, and festivities in the king's honour, and a multitude of Warwickshire gentlemen accompanied him to the borders of Gloucestershire. A splendid spectacle of fireworks had been prepared in London to greet his return, which were displayed, in St. James's Square, in presence of the king, of Anne, Princess of Denmark, and all the ambassadors.

The general result of the elections was favourable to William's policy and to the prosecution of the war. One of the first matters which pressed for consideration was the great deterioration of the coin. Until recent times, metal at the mint had been divided with shears, and afterwards shaped with tools. To clip such coin was an easy kind of fraud. In the reign of Charles II. a mill was set up in the Tower of London by which good money was produced; but as the bad remained in circulation, the good coins were exported or melted down. The evil arising from this debased money, which was felt by every class, had for some time occupied the serious attention of able men. The best mode of rectifying it was long disputed, but it was at last settled that all the money should be recoinced, and no clipped pieces be allowed to pass in payments to the government after a certain fixed interval.² Isaac Newton, who had been appointed warden of the Mint, devoted much time and valuable thought to this important subject. In 1701 he was chosen member of Parliament for Cambridge.

¹ Macaulay, iv. 599. In the year 1451 all the provinces of France over which the English had ruled submitted to Charles VII.; only Calais remaining in the hands of the English. The people of Guienne, who had been long accustomed to the English rule, disliked the change, and sent a deputation offering to renew their allegiance. In consequence of this appeal, another expedition was sent under the Earl of Shrewsbury, but was speedily defeated.

² The discussion of this great difficulty occupies several pages of Macaulay's fourth vol.

The king had set his heart upon endowing his friend Bentinck, whom he had created Duke of Portland, with wealth equal to that of the richest nobleman of England. He had already bestowed upon him part of the hereditary domains of the crown, a gift which does not appear to have been contrary to precedent, although it occasioned murmurs. But at length William went further, and by ordering a grant to be made out for conferring on Portland a great estate in Denbighshire, valued at more than £100,000, awakened the serious opposition not only of important persons in Wales, but also of the House of Commons, which unanimously addressed the king against the grant. Portland was too loyal an adherent to look with unconcern on the loss of his sovereign's popularity, and William, at his suggestion, withdrew the obnoxious proposal.¹

This affair had occasioned angry feelings on both sides, when news of another attempt to invade England, and to end the life of the king, once more brought back the full tide of loyalty. An intended insurrection in England had been abandoned the previous summer for want of encouragement from France. It was now revived, and the Duke of Berwick, illegitimate son of James, was employed to ascertain what force might be expected from the English Jacobites, to inform them of the troops and transports in course of preparation at Calais, and to assure them that, so soon as a rebellion should break out, his father would bring over 12,000 veteran soldiers. But besides this, there was another, a blacker plot of assassination, which was apparently sanctioned by the father-in-law of the King of England.

After Mary's death William must have felt that his life was in greater danger. He had no children; the heir to the throne was the Princess Anne, a weak woman married to a weak man; and the bond of the great confederation against France would be broken, the bulwark of English liberty would be overthrown, with the destruction of his life. There might still be another recall of the Stuart dynasty, a return to Roman Catholic ascendancy, and renewed subserviency to Louis XIV. To insure such objects, to place himself if possible in the place from which he had been eight years before ignominiously driven, James concerted with desperate men, whom he encouraged to act in any manner against the king, whom he called the usurper of the English throne. Sir George Barclay, a Scottish refugee at St. Germain's, was taken into confidence by James, and having received a commission written by him, secretly

¹ Macaulay, iv. 646-647.

landed at an obscure part of Kent, arranged a mode of communication between the conspirators and St. Germain's, and planned an attack upon the king's person. It was William's practice to go every Saturday from Kensington Palace to hunt in Richmond Park. There being then no bridge on that side of London, he crossed the Thames in a boat at Turnham Green. When going he was attended by guards and frequently by a large retinue, but when returning his escort was small.

It was planned that the attack should be made in the narrow and marshy lane in which the king was conveyed in his carriage from the river to Turnham Green, and that it should take place on February 15. But Berwick found it difficult to excite the Jacobite aristocracy to insurrection. If, indeed, James should appear in England with a French army, they promised to support him; but Louis was not more eager than they to risk the lives of his soldiers on such a doubtful adventure. When, in 1690, the French landed in Devonshire, they had received no English support; again, in 1692, the French aid which had been prepared was lost by the naval defeat at La Hogue. The King of France declared that the English Royalists must first exert themselves. Preparations were, however, made at Calais, and James flattered himself that, if Barclay's plot should succeed, there would be little doubt of the favourable turn of affairs in England. He waited at Calais for the concerted signal, the fire to be kindled on the Kentish cliffs, which would intimate that William had fallen by a violent death.¹ But happily he waited in vain! It has been frequently experienced that among a band of conspirators, one or two shrink at the last from participation in so base a crime as murder.

Among the associates was a Roman Catholic gentleman, named Pendergrass, who was esteemed a man of honour. He went to the Duke of Portland, told him that a conspiracy was formed against the king's life, refused to name those concerned, but urged that William should not hunt the next day. The advice was followed. Before the following Saturday another informer presented himself at the palace; it was plain that mischief was imminent, and Pendergrass was reluctantly persuaded to write down the names of the principal conspirators. Their arrest was speedy; Lord Romney, warden of the Cinque Ports, started for the coast of Kent; Lord Russell hastened to take the command of the fleet, and the lord mayor was warned to take charge of London.

On the morning of Monday, February 24, all the trainbands

¹ Macaulay, iv. 660.

of the city were under arms. The king went in state to the House of Lords, sent for the Commons, and declared from the throne his narrow escape from assassination, and the imminent danger of an invasion from France. He had taken immediate measures for defence, some traitors were already in custody; and he relied on Parliament for assistance. The aid of Parliament was not wanting. To guard against the danger of an attempted revolution at the end of the reign it was provided that Parliament should not, as usual, be dissolved immediately on the king's death. It was proposed by a country member that the House of Commons should form an association for the defence of their sovereign and their country, and a bond was immediately drawn up by which the representatives bound themselves to stand by King William against James Stuart and his adherents, and, in case of his Majesty's life being shortened by violence, vowed revenge on his murderers, and promised to support the line of succession which was settled by the Bill of Rights.

The king's speech, the joint address of the two Houses, and this plan of association in his defence, were soon spread through London, were carried to the country, and received with acclamation. The 'two hateful words, assassination and invasion, acted like a spell.'¹ Seamen were ready to man the fleet, the militia of all the counties from the Wash to the Land's End were under arms. The zeal of the populace against the base men who would have been concerned in the assassination plot knew no bounds. Within thirty-six hours after the deed of association had been published, it was signed by the lord mayor and nearly all members of the corporation of London, the country following the example; and at the spring assizes men of all ranks came eagerly to write their names on the parchments. Of those in the country able to write it has been computed that a large majority signed their names. The enthusiasm even spread to the rude fishermen of the Scilly Isles; while English merchants settled at Malaga, Genoa, or New York, even the planters of Virginia and Barbadoes, testified their patriotism undiminished by distance. Jacobitism was not, indeed, extinct, but many who, according to Evelyn, had pitied King James's condition were alienated by his intended employment of assassination, and by his recourse to the French army for the advancement of his personal ends.²

Whilst Barclay, who had been the prime mover in the assassination plot, succeeded in escaping to France, several other

¹ Macaulay, iv. 668.

² 'Evelyn's Diary,' February 26.

conspirators were tried and executed, among whom were two knights, Friend and Parkyns. Sir John Friend was a rich brewer, who had spent much money in seditious plots, and, having received a colonel's commission from James, had been active in enlisting men and providing arms to assist the French invasion. He thought Barclay's plan too rash, but he had agreed to keep the secrets of his friends, and was found in concealment after the discovery. Sir William Parkyns was a wealthy knight and lawyer, who had sworn allegiance to King William, in order to retain his office, yet now joined in the plot for taking his life.¹

Saved from the machinations of his enemies, William again landed in Holland on May 7, 1696, and took the command of the allied forces near Ghent. The treasuries of both France and England had become impoverished. France was exhausted by the long war which she had carried on, and financial troubles in England made it difficult for William to pay his troops. Distress had arisen from the time having come for the calling in of the old clipped coinage, and the tardiness with which a fresh supply was issued by the Mint. Evelyn noted in his diary of May 13, that 'money was exceedingly scarce—none paid or received; all was on trust.' In private concerns the want of ready money was painfully felt, abroad it was even perilous to the great commander of the allied army. William had strained his private credit to procure bread for his army, and now dreaded that if supplies did not speedily arrive from England his troops would mutiny or desert. Happily the sum of £200,000 in gold or silver, which was positively required to satisfy the army, was advanced by the Bank of England in August. The office of warden of the Mint had of late become the sinecure of men of pleasure. It was now given to England's great natural philosopher, Sir Isaac Newton, who by his strict integrity and great skill in accounts speedily effected a complete reform, and the coinage increased rapidly, although still too slowly for the exigencies of the people.² Happily, as the king was popular and sympathy was generally felt for the soldiers, hardships which might in preceding years have occasioned a rebellion were borne with comparative patience. William

¹ See Macaulay, iv. 569, 585, 654, 677. The London crowd, which looked forward with especial eagerness to the execution of the two knights, was greatly disappointed when it was deferred owing to a resolution of the House of Commons that a committee should first examine them in the Tower, and seek by giving the hope of life to draw from them important disclosures. This hope was frustrated by their firmness, although both criminals acknowledged the acts for which they suffered execution.—Macaulay, p. 679.

² Ib. 695-705.

obtained no fresh victories this year, and could attempt no great military undertaking. During seven years, Louis XIV. had attempted in vain to break up the coalition of princes whom the dread of his ambition had united against him. During seven years, William had not lost one of his allies; but this year the Duke of Savoy deserted the confederacy.¹

On October 6 the king returned to England. An important inquiry awaited his decision. Sir John Fenwick, who had been under James high in favour and in military command, an indefatigable conspirator against King William's government, had been captured, and as a means of escaping condemnation endeavoured to cast serious suspicion on Lords Marlborough, Russell, Shrewsbury, and others of the king's highest and most useful adherents. But the king would not accept the charges, either as grounds of accusation against his present friends or as exculpation of one well known to have been long a traitor to his government. Admiral Russell had corresponded with James, but he had burned the French fleet at La Hogue; Marlborough had conducted the war successfully in Ireland, and was the principal friend of the Princess Anne; and Shrewsbury was secretary of state, and had been honoured by William with a dukedom and the Order of the Garter.²

Two witnesses were needful to convict a prisoner of high treason, and it was believed that there were only two persons whose testimony could convict Fenwick. A plan was laid by the Jacobites to induce both these men to leave England. One of them, named Porter, had been a witness against several of those who had lately suffered for their share in the assassination plot, and he now betrayed Fenwick. A bill for high treason had been found by the grand jury on the evidence of Porter and Goodman. When the king refused to listen to Fenwick's charges, there appeared to be yet a chance of defeating his trial if Goodman should withdraw, and, by means of threats and promises, he was carried off to St. Germain's.

The government was highly incensed at being thus baffled. If no jury could then find Fenwick guilty of high treason, was he to escape? It was determined that the method which had been so much used during the troubles of the sixteenth century, and of which both Roundheads and Cavaliers had availed themselves at a later period, should be tried again against Fenwick. It appeared impossible to allow a man, whose long series of offences against the state were so well known, to remain unpunished, merely because he had succeeded in bribing a mate-

¹ Macaulay, iv. 709.

² *Ib.* 505-718.

rial witness to suppress his evidence.¹ A large majority of the House of Commons voted in favour of bringing in a Bill of Attainder, but the justice of the measure was violently contested.

On November 13, Fenwick was brought to the bar of the House. The witness was interrogated, and some of the grand jury who had found a true bill on Goodman's evidence gave their testimony. After counsel had been heard, and the prisoner had withdrawn, the struggle of parties began, during which the House repeatedly sat from daybreak till near midnight. Debates were rarely at that time continued into the night, and the presence of strangers was unusual, but it was considered that as the House was taking the place of a court of justice, it ought to sit with open doors. It was pleaded by the opponents of the measure that it was dangerous to break down 'the partition which separates the functions of the legislator from those of the judge.'² In trial by jury every care is taken to preserve the impartiality of the jurors, who feel themselves responsible for their verdict. The members of Parliament were less under the restraint of responsibility, and more liable to be swayed by faction. It had occurred many times in past ages that an Act of Attainder which was passed from servility or party rancour, had been afterwards repealed and solemnly condemned as unjust. There were indeed occasions of public danger when attainder was justifiable, but the present state of the realm was not so perilous as to require the use of so questionable a mode of bringing an offender to punishment. Arguments of this kind materially affected the House, and although the Bill passed, the majority was only thirty-three in its favour. It was then taken to the House of Lords, before whom Fenwick repeatedly attended, and the debates which ensued were the longest, the most excited, and the most numerous attended that had ever been known in the House of Peers.

After the second reading of the Bill, Fenwick was again summoned to the bar, and encouraged by the hope of pardon if he would freely disclose the secrets of his party. But this he resolutely refused to do. His resolution was taken from the first, that, if possible, he would, by a pretended confession, sow dissension between the king and the party supporting his government, but would say no word to injure the Jacobites. A very small majority, only of seven votes, supported the third reading.³

Strenuous efforts were made to save Fenwick's life. His

¹ Macaulay, iv. 737.

² Ib. 747.

³ Sixty-eight votes to sixty-one.

wife, Lady Mary, sister of the Earl of Carlisle, threw herself at the king's feet with a petition. William took the paper, but told her with gentleness that it was a matter of public concern on which he must advise with his ministers. She then tried the House of Lords, who, on her plea that her husband needed time to prepare for death, granted him a week's respite.

The execution took place on January 28, and Sir John's rank, although it had not preserved his life, was allowed to render his fate less ignominious. He was brought to Tower Hill in the carriage of the Earl of Carlisle, surrounded by a troop of life guards, and the scaffold was hung with black. His remains were placed in a rich coffin, and buried by torch-light under the pavement of St. Martin's Church. 'No person has, since that day, suffered death in England by Act of Attainder.'¹

Louis XIV. had hitherto refused to acknowledge William's title as sovereign of Great Britain. Faithful to his ally, James, whom he still called the King of England, he had persisted in giving William no other title than that of Prince of Orange. But in the spring of 1697 the King of France offered terms of peace, declaring himself willing to cede part of his late conquests to Spain and to the Germanic empire, and to acknowledge the authority of 'King William III.' A congress was accordingly held in the village of Ryswick, situated between the Dutch town of Delft and the Hague, where there was a palace belonging to the Princes of Orange. Hither came the ambassadors of Germany and Spain, and other ministers of the confederation. Impatient of the dilatory steps by which the congress proceeded in its work, William opened a separate negotiation between his favourite statesman, the Duke of Portland, and Marshal Boufflers, who represented France, at Hal, a town ten miles from Brussels.

At length all the questions in dispute were arranged: Louis XIV. pledged his word of honour not to favour any further attempt against the government existing in England, and William in return promised not to molest the government of France. Louis had offered to cede Strasburg, one of his recent conquests, which had been formerly a free city of the German empire, but a recent victory over Spain caused him to alter his conditions, and, in the last month of the conferences, Louis insisted that Strasburg should remain a French city. Although disappointed at this change of purpose,

¹ See Macaulay, iv. 740-769.

William did not consider it sufficiently important to continue the war for the sake of wresting that fortress from France.¹

James had pleaded in vain his right, as the lawful King of England, to send a minister to the congress. At last, on September 10, peace was signed at Ryswick. The eagerness for this news had been very great in England. When the west wind delayed the packets from Holland, hundreds of thousands had waited with anxiety for the intelligence, which reached them at length on the 13th. On the 14th there were public rejoicings in London. After two more months, on November 14, William landed at Margate, and entered London on the 16th amidst all the signs of triumph and rejoicing which could be shown by a delighted people.² A public thanksgiving was appointed for the peace, to take place on December 2. On that day, St. Paul's Cathedral, which had been slowly rising to completion since the great fire of London, was first opened, twenty-two years after the first stone had been laid.

The day was kept with solemn thanksgivings and public rejoicings in all parts of England. There was, indeed, ample cause for joy. The dangers of war and treason had passed away, and there was peace both at home and abroad. Trade had revived, the currency had been restored, and the liberty which Englishmen so highly prize had been established on a firmer basis than in any preceding age. In the face of the world, the right of England had been acknowledged to determine her own constitution and her own religion.³

The great powers of Europe looked with some anxiety on the extent of the empire nominally ruled at this time by the feeble Charles II., King of Spain. Those dominions were more extensive than France and England united. The Spanish dominions in the Netherlands and in the Milanese might have formed two sufficient principalities, and Naples and parts of Mexico and South America were also under the same rule. But the feebleness of mere territorial extent unrulèd by wisdom, and unpervaded by patriotic intelligence, came to light in the decay of the Spanish empire. It gradually sank under a childless sovereign, whilst Holland, that 'small fragment' of Charles V.'s great empire which had been rescued the previous

¹ Macaulay, iv. 800. Strasburg remained a French city from that time till 1871.

² 'He was accompanied from Greenwich to Whitehall,' says Macaulay, 'by one long buzza.' The king wrote to Holland that he had never seen 'such a multitude of well-dressed people.'

³ See Dean Milman's 'St. Paul's,' p. 427.

century from the Spanish grasp, had risen to wealth and power by the industry, intelligence, and freedom of its inhabitants.¹ William, accordingly, could not feel satisfied with the peace of Ryswick, so long as the succession to the vast Spanish dominion remained doubtful whenever it might fall from the weak grasp of Charles II.

The King of Spain had two sisters; the elder of these married Louis XIV., but had, as a needful step to preserve the balance of power in Europe, renounced all claim to the Spanish crown, both for herself and her posterity—a renunciation which Louis had bound himself by the most solemn words to hold sacred. A younger sister of the King of Spain was the first wife of the present Emperor of Germany. She had also at her marriage renounced her right to the Spanish crown, but the renunciation had not been perfectly formal. Her only child had married the Elector of Bavaria, and in the young prince who was the son of that marriage prudent men believed they saw the best hope of an heir for Spain whose pretensions would not interfere with the peace of Europe. But the Emperor Leopold, grandfather of this young prince, was himself a claimant for the inheritance. It was true that his wife had renounced her claim; but he was the son of a Spanish princess of an older generation, the aunt of the present Charles II., and his claim was barred by no renunciation. These rival pretensions occupied the attention of all European politicians, and William hoped, by a negotiation which he carried on in Holland with the ministers of Holland and France and his favourite Duke of Portland, so to distribute the future inheritance as to prevent ‘a struggle which would shake the world.’² According to this, called the first Partition Treaty, the King of France agreed to support the pretensions of the electoral Prince of Bavaria, and, as he was still a child, it was agreed that his father, the elector, then viceroy in the Netherlands, should be regent of Spain during his minority. The Dauphin was to have Naples and Sicily, and the Milanese was allotted to the Archduke Charles. Such a disposal of his inheritance was not contemplated by the King of Spain without irritation; but, by the advice of his ministers, he adopted his nephew, the young Prince Francis Joseph of Bavaria, as his successor. The news that this prince had been declared heir to

¹ Macaulay, v. 96. The taxes had been raised so high in Spain that they ceased to be productive, and the gold brought from the South American mines afforded no lasting wealth to a country destitute of industry.—Lord Mahon’s ‘War of the Succession,’ p. 23.

² *Ib.* p. 100.

the Spanish throne was welcome to all the potentates of Europe, except to his grandfather, the emperor, whose indignation was great. But not many weeks after this had been apparently settled, all was reversed by the death of the young Prince of Bavaria, at Brussels, in the spring of 1699. It now appeared possible that Louis might agree to accept the younger Archduke of Austria instead, and William hoped when he left England that summer to establish this as the basis of a second Treaty of Partition. That treaty, which was not finally arranged till March, 1700, decided in favour of the claims of the Archduke Charles. But Louis XIV. continued to intrigue with Spain, and persuaded the weak and dying king that French protection alone could preserve the Spanish monarchy. Once more Charles II. made a will, and that will, which was the cause of much calamity to Europe, was kept secret during the short remainder of his life.

In January, 1698, a royal personage arrived in London whose visit marked an epoch in the world's history. The young Czar Peter, afterwards called the Great, who ruled over the largest empire in the world, had resolved that Russia should have a navy. At present Archangel was the only port, and all the shipping employed there was foreign. Not satisfied with attracting workmen from other countries, Peter determined to learn the art of ship-building himself, and had been working as a shipwright in the dockyard of Amsterdam. He came to England for further improvement, and he spent much time at Deptford. William, well aware of the Czar's dislike of court formality, paid him a private visit in his London lodgings, which was returned without parade.¹

William had been continually troubled by the national jealousy with which his English subjects regarded foreign interference. After the conclusion of the war, the House of Commons refused to maintain a standing army of more than 7,000 men, a force which the king considered quite inadequate to his own position and the security of the country, and they also insisted that this army should consist of Englishmen. William was reminded that in the declaration published in 1688 he promised to dismiss all his foreign troops when he should have effected the deliverance of England.

It was with painful feelings that the king found himself

¹ Macaulay, v. 71-77. In the same week of January that the Czar arrived in England, the ancient palace of Whitehall was nearly destroyed by fire. The Banqueting-House, noted as being the place of Charles I.'s execution, and where William and Mary accepted the crown, still remained, although in part defaced.

compelled to order the departure of his favourite Dutch guards, who accompanied him on his first arrival, had fought bravely at the Boyne, and against whom there was no imputation.¹ A great influx of Popish priests after the establishment of peace excited the fears of the Protestants and led to further restrictions. It was also decreed that the estate of any man who should, after the age of eighteen, decline to take the oaths of allegiance and supremacy should pass to his next Protestant kinsman, although, by subsequent compliance, the first possessor might regain it. Dr. Burnet, who called himself opposed to all persecution, nevertheless advocated this very injudicious Bill, on the plea that 'Papists must be at all times ill subjects to a Protestant prince,' especially, moreover, at a time when there was a Popish claimant for the crown.²

William had of late had friendly intercourse with the Princess Anne, and looked with interest on her only remaining child, the little Duke of Gloucester. Although the Earl of Marlborough had been under the king's displeasure, he was in 1698 nominated the young duke's governor, and Burnet, Bishop of Salisbury, his preceptor. But in July, 1700, the young prince died of an attack of fever, a loss which was much felt by the nation and which renewed the hopes of the Jacobites. A further settlement of the crown was needful, and Parliament recognised the policy of fixing the reversion, on the death of Anne, upon the Electress of Hanover and her descendants, they being the nearest Protestant branch of the royal line. Sophia, Electress of Hanover, was the daughter of the Princess Elizabeth, and grand-daughter of James I. The Bill of Rights was reviewed, and to the new Act of Settlement provisions were added guarding against foreign interference when the country should accept the rule of the German branch. No foreigner inheriting the English crown should be empowered to involve this country in war for the sake of his own territories, unless with the consent of Parliament, and no person not English by birth should be a member of either House, or hold any office, civil or military.³

¹ Macaulay, v. 151-179, and Burnet's History, iv. 152.

² Burnet's History, iv. Evelyn called this 'a hard law,' but justifiable on account of the conduct of France and of Popish insolence. This law, which 'was not executed according to its purpose,' was not repealed till 1778. See Hallam, ii. 341, note.

³ This 'sweeping disqualification,' which Hallam censures as illiberal, was, as he acknowledges, beneficial by restraining the narrow prejudices of George I.—Hallam, ii. 345-352. The eight articles inserted in the Act of Settlement, to take effect from the commencement of the accession of the House of Hanover, are there enume-

On November 3, 1700, Charles, King of Spain, expired, and Madrid anxiously awaited the disposition of affairs. By the will of Charles the whole of the Spanish monarchy was bequeathed to Philip, Duke of Anjou, the second son of the King of France, or, in case of his refusal, to the Archduke Charles of Austria. Louis thus at once broke through all his former promises, and the obligations of the late treaty, and accepted the splendid inheritance for his grandson. The whole court of France accompanied the duke, now called Philip V., for the first few miles of his journey, and Louis exclaimed in rapture that the Pyrenees had ceased to exist.

Had William been free to act as he pleased, he would have immediately declared war with France so soon as he heard the contents of the will. England, however, had not yet forgotten the burdens of the late war, and would not have willingly entered on another contest. But the degree of provocation needed by the English nation was soon given by the romantic benevolence of Louis towards his royal guest. In the spring of 1701, James Stuart was struck with mortal illness. Louis went to his bedside accompanied by his train of courtiers, and soothed the mind of James by the assurance that immediately after his death his son should be declared the lawful inheritor of the British crown. On September 16, James died, and immediately, by the command of Louis, a herald proclaimed before the palace gate the accession of the prince, who was to be called King James III. of England and VIII. of Scotland. Acclamations and illuminations announced an inheritance which produced only misery and disappointment, and the prince, who was afterwards known by the appellation of 'the Pretender,' went through the mockery of appointing ministers and conferring titles.¹

But this interference with the English succession could not be tolerated in England by either party. The cry for war which was raised in London was repeated throughout the realm. William felt that his time for action was come, although his strength was declining. He immediately ordered the English ambassador to quit Paris. When, after delay from adverse winds, he reached England on November 4, the citizens of London were eager to celebrate with additional honour the thirteenth anniversary of his landing at Torbay. But the king was not strong enough to take part in a procession, and went by the

rated, one of which empowered both Houses of Parliament to cause the removal of the judges.

¹ Macaulay, v. 295.

quietest route to Hampton Court. He took the opportunity of his favourable reception to dissolve Parliament, and the Whigs obtained an increased majority.

On December 30, William opened this his last Parliament with a speech which was declared by Burnet to be 'the best that he, or perhaps any other prince, ever made to his people.' After explaining with great earnestness the serious position of the country, he entreated his subjects to abstain from all hostile divisions, and declared his own forgiveness of all offences against himself. Both Houses denounced the title of the 'pretended Prince of Wales,' and refused to continue at peace with France until Louis should make full reparation for the indignity which he had offered by proclaiming James Stuart King of England. The king's speech, which was printed both in English and Dutch, and adorned with ornamental designs, was to be seen framed in numerous houses both of England and Holland.¹ The Bill abjuring the pretensions of James II.'s son did not, however, pass without a sharp contest, and before the king could affix his signature he was prostrated by mortal illness.

On February 20, William, when riding in the park of Hampton Court, fell and broke his collar-bone, an accident which did not prevent his subsequent attention to business, and about a week after its occurrence he addressed a written message to the House of Commons advocating the complete union of England and Scotland. He had desired that measure at the beginning of his reign, and he now earnestly wished to see it concluded. But the wish proved fruitless. On March 4 he was attacked by fever. A stamp was prepared, by which to impress the signatures which his hand could no longer write, and the Abjuration Bill thus received his assent. The Earl of Albemarle came in haste from Holland, announcing the preparations which had been made for an early campaign. William could not repress the wish that he might again have been the leader in the approaching contest, but he calmly resigned himself to death, thanked his physicians for care which he felt to be unavailing, and took a tender farewell of the Duke of Portland, that Bentinck who was always his cherished friend. He died on March 8. A gold ring and a lock of Mary's hair were found on his person.²

¹ Note from Oldmixon in Burnet's History, iv. 546; see also the praise accorded to William's speech by Lord Stanhope, who states it to have been written by Lord Somers.—'History of the Reign of Queen Anne,' p. 31.

² See the conclusion of Lord Macaulay's History, so interesting, both as describing William's death, and as a memento of his own.

Most fortunate was it for England that her crown was worn for nine years by 'so great a man, compared with whom the statesmen who surrounded his throne sink into insignificance.'¹ The losses occasioned to trade by the long-continued war diminished the people's gratitude; and William's sense of their ingratitude in compelling him to send back those regiments of Dutch guards and French refugees which he esteemed so highly had almost suggested the thought of abdicating the throne; but the horror caused by the assassination plots and the presumption of the King of France brought England to a better judgment.²

It was in this reign that the press, having been exempted from the control of the licenser, became free. The publication of obnoxious works was, indeed, still attended with danger to both author and publisher, as they were liable to prosecution by order of the sovereign in council or by one of the Houses of Parliament.

Prior to this reign, observes Hallam, religious liberty 'had no Magna Charta and Petition of Right' whereto appeal could be made. The Toleration Act would have been more comprehensive had not bigotry obstructed William's enlarged policy. When he suggested, in a speech from the throne, that all Protestants should be rendered capable of serving him in Ireland, zealous Churchmen were offended, as it tended towards a modification of the Test Act. The Dutch armies had been in a great measure composed of Catholics, many of whom had even taken part in the invasion of England, and the Tories turned this 'connivance at Popery into a theme of reproach.'³

In the next reign, under a queen inclined to Tory principles, Protestant bigotry regained its ascendancy.

¹ Hallam, ii. 311.

² Macaulay, v. 153.

³ Hallam, ii. 333, 336, 340.

CHAPTER XXXIII.

QUEEN ANNE.

A.D. 1702—1714.

THE accession of the Princess Anne, the next Protestant heir of the direct Stuart line, was proclaimed on March 8, the day of King William's death. The old chivalrous attachment to the sovereign's person had now yielded to watchful care for the national interests, and to the reign of parliamentary law, maintaining order with the smallest possible infringement on the liberty of the subject.

It was fortunate for the public tranquillity, and we may believe also for Anne's peace of mind, that her father did not survive the late king. She appears to have been by nature affectionate, and it would have been far more abhorrent to her character to have occupied the throne during her father's life, than to be simply concerned in the exclusion of a young half-brother, of about the same age as the son whom she lately lost, unknown, moreover, both to herself and to the English people. It is said that she wrote to her father, probably on the death of her son, asking his permission to accept the crown when it should become vacant through William's death, and at the same time signifying that, should a favourable opportunity occur, she would willingly restore it to the rightful heir. This conditional assurance did not, however, satisfy the ex-king, who declared that, should he survive him whom he persisted in calling the 'Prince of Orange,' he would land in England, even if accompanied only by three followers.¹ The death of James happily prevented that trial to his daughter's feelings; but there were many supporters of William's government now ready to sympathise with the excluded 'Prince of Wales,' and to think his

¹ 'Reign of Queen Anne,' by Lord Stanhope, p. 9.

ultimate elevation not improbable. It was well known that, so far as Anne could understand politics, she favoured the Tory party. She had offended both William and her sister by persisting in her close friendship with the Marlboroughs at the time when their loyalty was under suspicion. But after Anne's accession, Lady Marlborough, 'probably from some personal resentments,' threw her influence into the scale of the Whigs, and when she and her husband joined that party they communicated their feelings to the queen.¹ An intimate correspondence, unrestricted by the usual etiquette, had been long carried on between Anne and Lady Marlborough, under the fictitious names of 'Mrs. Morley' and 'Mrs. Freeman.' And when, after attaining the crown, Anne showered offices and honours on Lord and Lady Marlborough, and sent the earl to Holland as her ambassador, she still continued to use these familiar names, addressing even Lord Marlborough as Mr. Freeman.

Anne was at her accession thirty-seven years of age. She was warmly attached to the Church of England, and not indifferent to the dignity of the sovereign; but her intellect was far from bright, and that of her consort, Prince George of Denmark, was reputed as duller still.² The necessities of her high position constituted her the heir of the Revolution, and called her to the lead of that great confederacy which the late king had organised against France. The appointment of Marlborough as governor of the young Duke of Gloucester showed that his delinquencies were forgiven by the king, and Marlborough's subsequent conduct justified the belief that he might be safely left to the exercise of his great abilities.

On the 4th of May (or according to the new style, the 15th) war was proclaimed against France and Spain, in London, Vienna, and the Hague.

The military union, termed 'the Grand Alliance,' had for its object to preserve the balance of power from the exorbitant pretensions of France, and a struggle commenced which continued to agitate Europe for eleven years. 'The two hostile coalitions were,' says Macaulay, 'not unequally matched. On the one side were France, Spain, and Bavaria; on the other England, Holland, the Germanic Empire, and several inferior powers.'³ The Elector of Brandenburg joined the alliance on the condition that the Emperor of Germany would acknowledge his title as King of Prussia, and he became 'King Frederick,' the first

¹ Hallam, ii. 371.

² Stanhope's 'Queen Anne,' p. 38.

³ See Macaulay's essay on the 'War of the Spanish Succession.'

monarch of that state which now holds the ascendancy in Germany.¹

Prince George of Denmark, who had been made Duke of Cumberland, was ambitious of the honour of commanding the allied army in the Netherlands, but was so utterly unfitted for the post that the queen was obliged to be satisfied with naming him *generalissimo* of her forces, and lord high admiral, in which capacity he was assisted by a council of competent naval officers.²

It was admitted in Holland to be desirable that the British and Dutch troops should be united under one general; and, with just confidence in his great military skill, the Earl of Marlborough was named General-in-chief, and set off on July 2 to take the field. Prince Eugene of Savoy was the chief commander of the Imperial German army. During nearly two centuries there had been great rivalry between the monarchies of France and Spain; France constantly increasing, Spain dwindling in strength, and the minor powers of Europe allying themselves by turns with either side. Now, when the Duke of Anjou had been placed by his grandfather on the Spanish throne, that monarchy, with its possessions in America and the Indies, and the appendages of Sicily, Naples, Milan, and Flanders, was thrown on the side of France. It was only the decrepitude into which Spain had fallen, the present utter weakness of her fleets and armies, which inspired the allies with hopes of success.

The Dutch were the most prominently exposed to danger from French aggression. The Low Countries, formerly their barrier against France, had become one of its provinces.³ The first campaign in the Netherlands was favourable to the allied armies, although an attempt on the coast of Spain failed; and when Parliament assembled in October they congratulated the queen that the 'wonderful progress of her Majesty's arms, under the conduct of the Earl of Marlborough, had signally retrieved the ancient honour and glory of the English nation.' The Whig party resented the expression 'retrieved,' as insulting to the memory of the late king, but it was retained. Tidings which afterwards arrived of the capture and destruction of Spanish treasure-ships on the coast of Portugal greatly excited the public mind; and, when the queen went, on November 2, in state

¹ Stanhope, p. 46.

² The queen having requested Parliament to make provision for the prince in case of his surviving her, a pension was voted of £100,000 per annum, which was double the jointure previously given to any queen-dowager of England.—*Ib.*, p. 77.

³ *Ib.*, p. 48.

to the thanksgiving at St. Paul's, she was received with hearty exultation.

Lord Marlborough, on his return, was created a duke, but the queen's wish that a pension of £5,000 should be settled on the title did not meet with the approval of Parliament. Had the queen waited two years, the title and pension would have been granted with enthusiasm, but at present the military successes had not been splendid, and the appointments previously given to the duke and duchess were known to be lucrative.¹

In the last week of November, 1703, England was afflicted by the most terrible tempest ever recorded in this country's annals. The southern districts suffered the most severely, and among many victims are mentioned the Bishop of Bath and Wells, and his wife, Mrs. Kidder, who were crushed at night by the fall of chimneys. The Eddystone lighthouse, built of timber, and recently completed, was swept away. This is the only occasion on which the destruction caused by tempest has occasioned an address from Parliament to the sovereign. It dwelt upon the necessity for repairing the injuries sustained by the shipping, and was followed by a proclamation for a general fast.²

The Archduke Charles, who had been receiving royal honours in Holland, now arrived in England, and was entertained by the queen at Windsor. From England, the archduke, or King Charles III. of Spain, proceeded to Portugal, which favoured his pretensions, and in the last days of the year a commercial treaty was arranged between England and Portugal, by which English woollen manufactures were allowed to enter that country, and Portuguese wines were subjected to lower duties than those of France, when imported into England.

For some time the allies had little power to oppose the combined armies of France and Bavaria; and when the Hungarian insurgents, enraged by Austrian oppression, threatened Vienna, the Duke of Marlborough saw the necessity of transferring the seat of the war to the Danube. In the month of June, 1704, Marlborough was first associated with his great coadjutor, Prince Eugene of Savoy, 'possibly the greatest general who has ever in any age led the Austrian armies.' On

¹ The queen was much mortified by what she called, in a letter addressed to her 'dear Mrs. Freeman,' the malicious conduct of Parliament, and wished to make a grant to her favourites of £2,000 out of the privy purse, besides the £5,000, adding that 'nobody need know it.' The duchess declined this further bounty, but nine years afterwards, when fallen into disgrace at court, claimed and received the whole pension from the time when it was offered.—Stanhope, p. 66.

² *Ib.*, p. 103, and Macaulay's 'Essay on Addison.'

August 13, the allies, under the joint command of Marlborough and Eugene, opposed to Marshal Tallard and the Elector of Bavaria, fought the most celebrated battle of the age, called the battle of Blenheim, from the village which stands near the confluence of the Nabel with the Danube.¹ The victory of the allies was decisive, and Marshal Tallard and some other French officers of rank were among Marlborough's prisoners.

Eleven thousand of the best infantry of France had held the village of Blenheim, detached from the rest of their army. At length, finding escape from their position impossible and all their valour unavailing, they surrendered as prisoners of war. 'It was,' says Lord Stanhope, 'a bitter pang to these high-spirited soldiers, who for the last forty years had given the law to Europe.'² The loss on the French side was estimated at 40,000 men, that of the allies at about 12,000.

The spell which had been thrown over the world by the successes of Louis XIV. was now broken. William III. had stopped his advance, but his signal defeat was the work of Marlborough. England, on receiving the news of this great victory, was filled with rejoicings, and addresses were poured forth to the queen but the Jacobites, who regarded Louis as the benefactor of the exiled Stuarts, held back—'a coldness which only rendered the Whigs the more zealous and affectionate.'³ About the same time, Gibraltar came into the possession of the English. The English admiral, Sir George Rooke, had made a fruitless attempt to reduce Barcelona, when Gibraltar, which the Spanish government had left with a small garrison, became a tempting prize. The acquisition of this rock was not supposed of much importance until its value was attested by the great efforts of the Spaniards to regain it. The Duke of Marlborough returned to England on December 14, bringing with him Marshal Tallard and the other French officers, who were allowed to reside on parole in inland towns. Standards and trophies of victory were carried in triumph to Westminster Hall, and London exulted in a victory greater than any which had been achieved over foreign enemies since the repulse of the Spanish Armada. There was no longer any hesitation concerning the rewards to be accorded to the great general. At the queen's desire, the noble estate of Woodstock was settled upon the

¹ The real name of this village, says Lord Stanhope, is Blindheim. Prince Eugene, who was born at Paris in 1663, was thirteen years younger than Marlborough. By his descent an Italian, by training French, he had become a German by adoption. —Stanhope, pp. 129-141.

² *Ib.*, p. 151.

³ Burnet's History, v. 149-154.

Duke of Marlborough and his heirs, in feudal form, a standard being annually presented at Windsor Castle on August 2. Directions were given that a stately palace should be erected for the duke at the queen's expense, to bear the name of Blenheim.¹ The Emperor of Germany also testified his gratitude by giving Marlborough the title of Prince and the principality of Mindelheim. The principality was lost at the peace, but the double-headed eagle of the Germanic empire still forms part of the Duke of Marlborough's armorial bearings.

In June, 1705, an army of 5,000 English and Dutch troops was sent to support the pretensions of the Archduke Charles, under the command of Charles Mordaunt, Earl of Peterborough, an intrepid and adventurous general whose character has been thought to resemble that of Charles XII. of Sweden. Under Peterborough's protection, the archduke landed in Valencia, where the peasantry, suffering from the wretched misgovernment of Philip, were eager for a change, and shouted forth their welcome to 'Charles the Third.'

After considerable difficulties, Peterborough had the glory of taking Barcelona, one of the most considerable cities of Europe, and the Catalonians, flattered by the promised restitution of their ancient rights, became attached adherents of the Austrian king. Regardless of all ordinary obstacles, Peterborough advanced through mountainous country, even in the depth of winter, succeeded in saving Barcelona from recapture by the French, who attacked it by land and sea; and, in June, 1706, drove Philip and his household in terror from Madrid.

Charles III. was proclaimed in Madrid and Toledo, and the only chance of safety for Philip appeared to be flight into France. Spain, however, although it may be rapidly overrun, is not easily vanquished. After three provinces had declared in favour of Charles, and his rival's cause appeared desperate, the national spirit awoke in Philip's favour. Peterborough's eccentric impetuosity displeased the Austrian king; the English government gave the command of the forces to Lord Galway, an experienced officer; but on April 25, 1707, Galway was signally defeated on the plain of Almanza by the Bourbon army under the Duke of Berwick, with the loss of 18,000 men.² At the close of the year the province of

¹ It is said that, according to the condition, the standard is still annually presented, and may be seen at Windsor Castle by the side of the yearly standard of Strathfieldsaye.—Stanhope, p. 171.

² The Duke of Berwick was an illegitimate son of James II. An exile from

Catalonia was the only part of Spain which still adhered to Charles.

In the meantime the war in the Netherlands had been pursued by the allies with nearly uniform success, although Marlborough was at times perplexed by counsels differing from his own judgment. Another great victory, obtained at Ramillies on May 23, 1706, over Marshal Villeroy, was followed by the proclamation of Charles III. at Brussels, and Flanders was free from French domination.

While these events were passing abroad, measures were taken in England which largely affected important interests.

The last advice which William III. had given to Parliament was in favour of the more complete union of England and Scotland; and in the first year of Anne's reign some principal statesmen of both countries were summoned to Whitehall to discuss the conditions of a perfect union and combined Parliament. The Scots, as the poorer nation, sought exemption from the weight of English taxation; whilst English traders dreaded the importation of Scottish cattle and linens, and much time was lost in overcoming these jealousies. Many of the Scottish leaders would have preferred a federal union, like that of the Dutch states or the Swiss cantons; but when promised freedom of trade, the Scots assented to the proposal that England and Scotland should be for ever united by the name of Great Britain, should be represented by the same Parliament, and both acknowledge alike the terms of the recent Act of Settlement. Forty-five Scottish members were added to the English House of Commons, and sixteen peers to the Upper House, to be elected as representatives of their order. Englishmen who might have thought the concessions relating to trade and taxation too favourable to Scotland were reconciled to a change which promised to promote tranquillity and 'to shut the back-door against the practices of France, and the attempts of the pretended Prince of Wales.'

Nevertheless, the discontent in Scotland was so great as to excite the hopes of the Jacobites and to cause flattering reports to be carried to St. Germain's. It was determined that the royal assent should be given with all possible solemnity to this important measure, and on March 6, 1707, Anne declared from the throne in the House of Lords her confident hope that

England after the Revolution, he became a soldier of fortune.—See Macaulay's essay 'On the Spanish Succession.'

¹ Burnet's History, v. 13, 281–283. It was still deemed prudent to keep up the suspicion concerning the prince's birth, although all knew that he was really James's legitimate son.

‘the wealth, strength, and safety of the whole island’ would be advanced, and that her subjects of both nations would henceforth, by showing all possible respect and kindness to one another, let it appear to the world that they were in their hearts one people. The advantages which were promised to Scotland were not at first realised. Owing to the turmoil and discontent of the country, the cheapness of labour did not attract manufacturers from England; agriculture also remained unprogressive. The administration of justice, however, improved, and the general benefits of the union gained gradual acknowledgment.¹

Addresses of congratulation reached the throne from various parts of England, but Oxford University remained silent; it resented the recognition of the Presbyterian Church as the established Church of Scotland, and Jacobite emissaries from the continent were already sowing the seeds of rebellion. One Colonel Hooke, an exile in the service of France, spent some time among the Scottish nobles, and returned with assurances that, if ‘the young king’ would appear in Scotland, they would support him with 30,000 of their friends or vassals. As it would take time, however, to collect their forces, they besought the King of France to send them 10,000 men, or at least half that number; but Louis, though well inclined, decided to postpone the enterprise till the next year.

Charles XII. of Sweden, having now completed the conquest of Poland, took up his quarters that spring near Leipsic, where Louis XIV. sent to court alliance with the master of 40,000 victorious soldiers. Marlborough on the other side repaired also to Saxony, the bearer of a letter from Queen Anne, seeking to enlist the Swedish monarch as a member of the Alliance. Charles, however, disappointed both France and England through his impatience to turn his arms against the Czar, and in an evil hour he crossed the Oder. Louis therefore now determined to strike a blow on the vulnerable side of Great Britain. A naval squadron was prepared at Dunkirk, with the view of sending, early in the ensuing year, about 4,000 men to Scotland under the command of the young Stuart prince, who assumed the title of the Chevalier of St. George. Delayed by the prince’s temporary illness, the departure did not take place till March 17, when alarm had already been taken, and a fleet of English and Dutch forces was ready to assail the French squadron.

Favoured by the wind, the French admiral Forbin reached

¹ Laing’s ‘History of Scotland,’ iv. 405–412; Stanhope’s ‘Anne,’ p. 280.

Scotland and cast anchor, but found no friendly reception in reply to his signals. An alarm that the English fleet was approaching drove the French northwards, although the Scottish exiles on board besought the admiral to allow them to land in Aberdeenshire. They maintained that the adherents of the Stuart cause would rally in force if they should behold their prince; while James also was eager to try his chance, if even with no more support than that of his own retinue. Forbin, on the contrary, deemed any course too hazardous, except that of returning to France; and, abandoning an enterprise which had excited such great expectation, he regained Dunkirk harbour on April 7.

This vain attempt worked for a time a great change in the queen's disposition. She had been inclined to view her young half-brother as her possible successor; the difference of religion would have been to her mind almost the sole impediment; but when he was so bold as to invade her territories, her zeal in the cause of the established constitution was greatly strengthened. Hitherto Anne had never in her speeches alluded to the Revolution of 1688, deriving her title, like her sister's, from their father's family. But in the answers now given to congratulatory addresses that Revolution was respectfully mentioned, and when closing the session, on April 1, she denounced 'the designs of a Popish pretender bred up in the principles of the most arbitrary government.'¹

On July 11, 1708, a fierce battle was fought in the Netherlands before the fortress of Oudenarde, by the Duke of Marlborough and Prince Eugene, under whom the son of the Elector of Hanover, afterwards our George II., took part with much bravery. On the French side were the young Dukes of Burgundy and Berry, grandsons of the king, and the Stuart prince, the Chevalier de St. George, who, in his eagerness to win military glory, rashly used his sword against his own countrymen. The experience of Marshal Vendôme, who was intended by Louis to be the real general, was obstructed by the authority claimed by the princes, and the allies obtained a complete victory. As a step towards invading the heart of France, Marlborough resolved to lay siege to Lille, which was one of Louis's earliest conquests, and the citadel and fortifications of which had been considered masterpieces of Vauban's skill. This siege, upon which Marlborough and Eugene were determined to spare no pains, and which Louis was as strenuous to prevent, caused extraordinary interest throughout Europe.

¹ Burnet, v. 359; Stanhope, p. 342.

Augustus, the lately dethroned King of Poland, served under Marlborough, and Prince Maurice of Savoy, a youth who had contrived to escape from his instructors, was there taking lessons of war which enabled him in after years to be a successful French general.¹ After showing great skill and valour in the defence of Lille, Marshal Boufflers surrendered the citadel on December 9, and was allowed by the allied generals to march out with all the honours of war at the head of his faithful soldiers. At Versailles that kind reception was accorded him which Louis XIV. never refused to officers of proved bravery, even when unsuccessful.

In England, the death of the queen's husband, Prince George, on October 28, 1708, removed one whose incapacity had obstructed public affairs, but to whom the queen was fondly attached. Louis was at last eager to conclude peace. The state of the French finances and the unprecedented severity of the weather brought upon France in the winter of 1708-9 great increase of suffering. There were even fears for the coming harvest.²

The ministers of the allied powers met at the Hague to arrange terms of peace. The Duke of Marlborough was instructed to demand, on the part of England, that Louis should acknowledge Queen Anne's title and the Protestant succession, should send the Stuart prince from the French dominions, and demolish the fortifications of Dunkirk. The Dutch required the cession of ten fortresses, on the Flemish frontier, including Lille, which the king had just lost, and Tournay, which he still held. Strasburg, with its province of Alsace, and the Duchy of Luxemburg were also demanded, and the smaller princes of Germany sent their envoys, 'each hungry for some fragment of France.'³ Besides these hard terms for France, no favourable concession was offered to Philip of Spain. Marlborough declared that no portion of the great Spanish monarchy should remain in the hands of a Bourbon. The King of France resolved to try the effect of a bribe, and offered secretly to Marlborough a present of two millions of livres if, through his influence, Naples and Sicily, or even Naples alone, could be reserved for Philip, or France be spared the cession of Strasburg or the demolition of Dunkirk. But Marlborough was firm.⁴ In this

¹ Stanhope, p. 356.

² The frost was less severe in England. We are told that in Normandy the apple-trees perished, in Provence the olive-trees; blight fell upon the corn-lands of Anjou, and on the vineyards of Gascony.—Ib., p. 379.

³ Ib., p. 381.

⁴ Ib., p. 382. The French ambassador had no hope of seducing Heinsius, the first man in the Dutch Republic, whose plain and simple life averted from him the suspicion of self-interest.

difficulty Louis made an appeal to Philip V., whereupon the young king declared that he would maintain his position as King of Spain so long as a drop of blood flowed in his veins. His power now appeared to be strong, for nine-tenths of Spain acknowledged his rule. What authority, then, had Louis to require his grandson's resignation? The allies did not even offer an immediate peace upon these conditions. A suspension of arms would be followed by a congress at the Hague, and unless the allies were then satisfied they might re-commence war. Louis summoned all his relatives and ministers of state to consider the proposed terms, and they were all unanimous against yielding. The late defeats sustained at Blenheim and Ramillies had prepared them to make large concessions; the ten fortresses might have been given up as a barrier to Holland; but these conditions were too severe, and the prospect too uncertain. By the advice of his minister, Louis, 'for the first time during his reign of fifty years,' appealed to his people. That appeal roused the martial spirit of the nation, and although wasted and impoverished by famine and recently dispirited, they responded with the patriotic pride which has been for ages implanted in the hearts of Frenchmen. Whether or not it was unjust in the allies to demand that France should yield all which she had acquired since the peace of Westphalia, it was certainly impolitic, for it supplied France with renewed determination to persist in war.¹

Marlborough and Prince Eugene were soon again in Flanders at the head of 110,000 men, and Marshal Villars took command of the French army. On September 11 a bloody battle was fought at Malplaquet, on the north-western border of France, with but little result, for although Marshal Villars acknowledged his defeat, he wrote to the king that his enemies would be nearly annihilated by another such battle. The loss of the French was computed at 12,000, but that of the allies was said to exceed 20,000 men. Marlborough was humane. The sight of the numbers of dead and dying men lying on the field of battle affected him greatly, and he at once proposed a suspension of arms for relief and burial, and sent assistance to many of the wounded French who had taken shelter in the neighbouring woods.

Parties had run high in England, and soon after this time the power of Parliament was unwisely employed against an obnoxious clergyman. Dr. Sacheverell, a clergyman of the school of Laud, Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, and rector

¹ Stanhope, p. 389.

of St. Saviour's in Southwark, took advantage of the commemoration of the Gunpowder Plot on November 5, to preach, before a Tory lord mayor, a sermon against resistance to tyranny, denying the principles which had justified the Revolution, and casting severe censure upon the Dissenters and even upon those who tolerated them. The sermon was, of course, much disliked by the Whig party, and some of the allusions so stung one of the ministers that he determined, contrary to the advice of the more sagacious and temperate Lord Somers, on the impeachment of the preacher.

The House of Commons voted that two sermons published by Dr. Sacheverell were malicious and scandalous libels, highly reflecting upon the queen's government and the late happy Revolution, and summoned both the writer and the printer to their bar. It was finally determined that a committee of the Commons should conduct the impeachment, which soon became the great subject of public attention. The trial, which began in Westminster Hall on February 27, lasted three weeks. As the time drew near, its gross impolicy became the more apparent. The love of justice inherent in Englishmen has on several occasions been shown by their favouring any one attacked by a political party, even when the person attacked was clearly wrong.¹ Clergymen who would not, like Sacheverell, have upheld the doctrine of passive obedience, country gentlemen who were far from being adverse to the Revolution, and the populace who clamoured for fair play, all now sided with the Tory preacher. The queen had called the sermon bad and worthy of punishment, but she found some of her own chaplains taking the side of the accused, and when curiosity led her to the hall, the people pressed round her chair shouting in favour of Dr. Sacheverell. A majority of eleven peers found him guilty, and a still smaller majority restrained him from preaching for three years. A resolution was passed that the two sermons should be publicly burned, as was also that decree of Oxford University of 1683, which maintained the absolute authority of princes, and on which Sacheverell had based his defence. Lord Godolphin, the minister who had instigated the trial, lamented, in a letter to Marlborough, that 'all this bustle and fatigue' had ended in so trivial a result. The light punishment was hailed with public rejoicing; Sacheverell became the fashion; his voice was still to be heard in London, for he was only prohibited from preaching. Many ladies sent for him to baptize their children, and his name was frequently adopted.

¹ Stanhope's 'Anne,' p. 410.

The queen had always been at heart a Tory, but had been inclined in favour of the Whigs by her partiality for the Duchess of Marlborough. The duchess was violent and proud; she had outraged the propriety of the court; Anne had now another female favourite, and the affection which she had felt for the duchess was succeeded by strong aversion. She turned out her Whig ministers and dissolved Parliament, and the result of the elections favoured the Tories. From the beginning of the reign the High Church party had laboured to depress the Dissenters, by passing a Bill to prevent what was termed 'Occasional Conformity.' The Test Act, which was passed in 1673, in order to exclude Roman Catholics from office, required that all persons about to become magistrates or take public office, should previously attend the parish church and receive the communion. The friends of the Roman Catholics clamoured against this Act, as one of religious intolerance; the Dissenters frequently evaded it by attending one ceremonial only, after which they continued faithful to the services of their own sect. Many rich citizens of London were Dissenters, and Sir Humphrey Edwin had even caused the city mace to be carried to the meeting-house which he attended, an act which had excited much disapprobation.¹ As the Dissenters who thus obtained office generally gave their support to the Whigs, the Tories gladly availed themselves of a pretext for their exclusion, and inveighed against the hypocrisy of those who thus submitted to a religious rite in preparation for entering on worldly dignity. The queen showed marked approval of the Bill, and had encouraged Prince George to vote for it, although it condemned his own practice, for he, who generally attended a Lutheran chapel, had obtained the office of lord high admiral by one attendance at the Church of England. The Bill had passed the Lower House in the year 1702, but was defeated by the majority of the Lords. A large majority of the bishops who owed their elevation to the late king opposed it. The next year it was tried again, and again rejected; also in 1704, by an increased majority of the peers, but it was not yet abandoned.

In 1711 the Tory ascendancy facilitated the efforts of its

¹ See Dr. Calamy's 'Historical Memoirs,' i. 400. 'Many of the magistrate's friends' heartily wished that this action had been waived, as tending to outrage. This Sir Humphrey was lord mayor in 1697, and, when William III. went in state through the city, had the honour of carrying the sword before him. According to Calamy, he 'not only worshipped God with the Dissenters, but carried the regalia with him, which much disgusted many of the Church of England.'

promoters, and, after a disgraceful compromise between the rival parties, Lord Nottingham carried this intolerant Bill, by which it was enacted that any holder of office, civil or military, who, after receiving the sacrament according to the obligations of the Test Act, should whilst remaining in office attend any conventicle or religious meeting of Dissenters, should forfeit £40, to be given to the prosecutor, and be disabled from holding any trust or employment in England. The Tory majority in the House of Commons exulted in having at length obtained this measure, which continued in force without alteration for more than seven years.¹ In consequence of this Act many opulent Dissenters discontinued public worship in their chapels, and the celebrated Dr. Watts preached privately at Islington to the family of Sir Thomas Abney.² The queen was now determined to support that which she viewed as the Church party by the utmost stretch of her prerogative. The ministers determined to destroy Marlborough's power, to end the war, and to overbalance the Whig majority in the House of Lords by creating twelve new peers. A charge of peculation connected with the management of the finances employed in the war was brought against the duke, and the queen suddenly dismissed him from all his appointments. The proceedings which were taken against some of the late administration have been described as 'blind vengeance.' Robert Walpole, who had been secretary at war, was accused of illicit gains, and sent to the Tower, and a considerable majority of the House of Commons condemned the conduct of Marlborough with regard to the contract for army bread. The duke declined to plead before the House, not acknowledging the members as his judges, but he caused a statement to be drawn up in his defence, which was afterwards published, and which Lord Stanhope calls 'a convincing paper.' It fully replied to the charges, and showed that they were unfairly pressed.³

The war has been called a Whig war; it was instigated by the act of Louis XIV. in proclaiming the young Stuart prince King of England, and had been maintained by the Emperor of Germany to prevent the undue preponderance of France combined with Spain. When the Tories came into office in England, they were desirous of peace, and in many ways the

¹ Stanhope, pp. 498-503.

² Calamy's 'Memoirs,' ii. 244; Burnet's History, vi. 84.

³ Stanhope's 'Queen Anne,' p. 515. Macaulay, although generally severe against Marlborough's character, speaks of the severity with which the duke and Walpole were now treated by the Tories as unjust.—Essay 'On the War of Succession in Spain.'

circumstances abroad had changed. Of late, the principal scene of hostilities had been Spain, and that country was overrun by the armies of the two rivals.

In June, 1710, both the kings were on the battle-field, and King Charles supped in the house in which King Philip had just previously dined. The forces under Philip were almost entirely Spanish, but on the other side was heard a confusion of foreign tongues. The allies, commanded in part by General Stanhope, were for a time victorious, and Charles entered Saragossa in triumph, but shortly afterwards the tide turned, and Stanhope, with his brave little army, became prisoners of war, their defeat being hailed with great joy by the inhabitants of Castile. Spanish zeal was aroused against invaders who were partly hated as heretics; and when the Duke of Vendôme was sent by Louis to take the command, Philip rapidly recovered his lost ground.

The death of the Emperor Leopold in 1705 had placed Joseph, brother of King Charles of Spain, on the imperial throne. In April, 1711, the Emperor Joseph, only thirty-three years of age, died of small-pox, which also in the same month proved fatal to the Dauphin of France. The next heir to the empire was Charles III. of Spain. The balance of power would be endangered if the empire and the Spanish monarchy should be thus united. Charles, who was unable in Spain to cope with his opponents in the field, soon abandoned the Peninsula, and on October 12 was in due form elected Emperor of Germany with the title of Charles VI.¹

Death was striking heavily the heirs of the House of Bourbon. In February, 1712, died the Duke of Burgundy, Dauphin of France, the pupil of Fénelon, on whom the hopes of a better reign had rested; his wife and his little son of five years both expired of the same malady, a malignant kind of measles. The life of one sickly infant, two years of age, who bore the title of Duke of Anjou, was the sole remaining bar between Philip of Spain and the throne of France, from which such pains had been taken to exclude him.² The English ministers had for some months carried on secret negotiations in France, and Louis considered that he had good friends at the court of St. James's. A French priest named Gualtier resided for some time in London, who, using feigned names in his correspondence, assured the French minister of the favour with which Queen Anne re-

¹ Stanhope, p. 488.

² The infant duke survived to be Louis XV. The Duke of Burgundy had been Dauphin only nine months, since the death in April, 1711, of his elder brother.

garded the young Stuart prince. A letter is said to have been sent by James to the queen, assuring her that he reposed the utmost confidence in her inclination to favour him.

It does not appear, says Lord Stanhope, that Anne sent any reply, nor can her wishes at this time be certainly known. Her attachment to the Church of England might more than balance her feeling in favour of a brother whom she had not seen since he was in his cradle.¹

On June 6, 1712, the queen went down to the House of Lords, to fulfil, as she declared, her promise of communicating to her Parliament the terms of peace. She assured the House of the particular care with which she had maintained the succession of the House of Hanover, for which she had taken security 'by the removal of that person out of the French dominions who pretended to disturb this settlement.' She described the measures taken to prevent the monarchies of France and Spain from ever vesting in the same ruler. France would cede to England its portion of the island of St. Kitts, with Newfoundland and Nova Scotia; Spain would give up to England the fortress of Gibraltar, the island of Minorca, and the monopoly of the slave trade for thirty years. Other stipulations in the interests of the confederates would be adjusted in the congress soon to be held at Utrecht. The Commons unanimously approved the proposals. In the House of Lords there was a keen debate, and a protest against the terms of the treaty was signed by twenty-four peers, including Marlborough. This, although expunged from the journals, was circulated through the country, notwithstanding the threatened prosecution of all persons concerned in its dissemination.

But considerations of the balance of power were urged in favour of peace, instead of a prolonged war, bringing with it a host of evils. Spain had repelled the Archduke Charles, and he had now received by inheritance the imperial throne of Germany. Philip IV., who might, in case of the death of his infant nephew, be called to the French throne, was ready to renounce that claim. With regard to the young Stuart prince, whose threatened elevation had been the great provocation to the war, it was agreed that ostensibly Louis should abandon him, although secret negotiations between the court of France

¹ Stanhope's 'Queen Anne,' p. 513. This prince, frequently called afterwards in history the elder Pretender, the son of James II. by his second wife, Mary of Modena, was born in the year 1688, thus being twenty-four years younger than Queen Anne. Soon after his birth, Anne wrote to her sister Mary, implying a doubt of his paternity.

and Queen Anne's Tory ministers encouraged the hope of his ultimate succession.

The principal of these ministers were Harley, Earl of Oxford, and Henry St. John, the patron of the poet Pope, who was raised in 1712 to the title of Lord Bolingbroke, and who, when he went to France to adjust the terms of peace, was received by Louis with much honour.¹ There were delays respecting the barrier of Holland, and the terms at length agreed upon were far more favourable to France than those which had been partly conceded before the battle of Malplaquet. On March 31 a treaty of peace between England and France was signed at Utrecht, and separate treaties between the other States and France re-established general peace in Europe.

The Elector of Hanover had meanwhile received the title of Duke of Cambridge, and, as such, claimed, through his ambassador, a summons to sit in the House of Lords.

Queen Anne had trusted the direction of her government to acknowledged Tories, some of whom afterwards proved to be Jacobites. Although withheld both by prudence and by strong Protestant feeling from testifying preference for her brother's cause, Anne strongly objected to a proposal, made by several friends of the House of Hanover, that the elector should be invited to reside in the country over which he must eventually rule, and she is said to have given her most gracious smiles to those who ventured to express sympathy for her exiled kindred.

By the queen's own choice, and against the judgment of her advisers, two bishops of High Church and Tory principles had been appointed in 1707.² In 1713, Dr. Atterbury, a Tory writer, who was one of the queen's chaplains, was promoted to the bishopric of Rochester, and deanery of Westminster; and in conjunction with this powerful partisan Lord Bolingbroke brought forward the celebrated Schism Act, for the further abasement of the Protestant Dissenters, forbidding any person to keep a school or act as tutor unless he subscribed to the tenets of the Church of England, and obtained a licence from a bishop; in default of which he should be committed to prison without bail. A large majority of the House of Commons voted for this tyrannical Act.

In passing through the House of Lords it was slightly mitigated by a clause which permitted school-mistresses unpledged

¹ Hallam, ii. 386; Stanhope, pp. 536-540.

² The anger of the Whig party on this occasion was so strongly shown that the queen was compelled to give them the assurance that she would satisfy them by future appointments.—Stanhope's 'Queen Anne,' p. 316. According to Hallam, the queen was herself reluctant to promote Atterbury to Rochester (ii. 408).

to orthodox opinions to educate the children of Dissenters. An exemption was also made on behalf of tutors residing in noble-men's families—a proof that at this period the House of Lords had not, like the Commons, receded from the principles of the late Revolution.

‘It is impossible,’ says Hallam, ‘to doubt for an instant that if the queen’s life had preserved the Tory government for a few years every vestige of toleration would have been effaced.’¹ But at the close of 1713 it became evident that a crisis was approaching. Fear for the preservation of the Act of Settlement produced a coalition between all sections of public men who were attached to the Protestant succession.² The queen’s last public act was to place the lord treasurer’s staff in the hands of the Duke of Shrewsbury; a special meeting of the privy council was summoned, and an express messenger was sent to Hanover to urge the elector to hold himself in readiness to arrive in England immediately after the queen’s death. Such was the conflict of parties, that it was thought by some that whichever competitor for the crown should first appear would have the better chance of success.³ Both Whigs and Tories who wished well to the Hanoverian succession desired that the electoral prince, the son of the elector, should be invited to England; but the queen, whose aversion to the House of Hanover was very apparent, wrote on May 19 to the elector to oppose a project which she declared ‘so contrary to her royal authority.’ The aged Princess Sophia, although in her eighty-fourth year, is said to have hoped that the words ‘Queen of England’ might have been engraved on her coffin; but she died on May 28, the day after that on which she also received from Queen Anne a letter forbidding the projected arrival of her grandson.

Not venturing any further alteration of the settlement of the crown, and apparently ‘wavering among opposite impulses,’ with no real regard for her young half-brother, on August 1 Queen Anne expired. Had she survived only three months longer, and had Bolingbroke and Oxford gained ascendancy, the tottering cause of constitutional monarchy might again have been subverted by Stuart rule.

Weak as was Anne’s character, she frequently contrived to exert a degree of influence incompatible with the established rules of a constitutional monarchy. It has been said that she

¹ ‘Constitutional History,’ ii. 411.

² Macaulay, ‘On Addison.’

³ Hallam, ii. 391, note. The Duke of Shrewsbury has been called a Hanoverian Tory.

interfered in nominating bishops without the consent of her ministers.¹ Three years afterwards, when she was entirely guided by her new female favourite, Mrs. Masham, the queen peremptorily insisted that the command of a regiment should be given to her favourite's brother, Colonel Hill, an act of interference still more unbecoming her position, and in direct contravention of the great duke's opinion.

By her frequent presence in Parliament she attempted to increase her personal influence; and on one occasion Marlborough, hard pressed by his opponents for having delayed the conclusion of peace, directed a personal appeal to her when sitting in the House of Lords, although not on the throne, declaring that the queen had knowledge that he had always informed her Majesty and her council of all the proposals of peace, and had anxiously promoted a favourable termination of the war.² Such an appeal, made in the royal presence, would have been impossible under any succeeding sovereign. Although Anne's feelings were mostly influenced by her partiality or enmity for a very small number of persons, yet when parties were so nearly balanced, the fortunes of Europe were sometimes affected by her caprices.³ In the year 1710, the queen, guided by Mrs. Masham, obliged Lord Sunderland to quit the office of secretary of state. Sunderland was son-in-law of the Duke of Marlborough, and a meeting of the Whig party was immediately held at the house of the Duke of Devonshire, and a memorial sent to the duke, then abroad with the army, entreating him not in resentment to abandon his command, as this alone could avert an entire dismissal of the ministry, and a dissolution of Parliament. Marlborough complied with their desire, and wrote most urgently to his wife, begging her to keep her temper, and adding that she was 'amongst tigers and wolves.' The fall of Sunderland occasioned a panic among moneyed men, and Sir Gilbert Heathcote waited on the queen to represent the injurious effects of such changes. Anne replied that she had dismissed the Earl of Sunderland from particular reasons of state, and did not at present intend to make any further changes.⁴ But in a few months the whole ministry was dissolved. 'The Whig ministry of Queen Anne,' says

¹ In 1707, nominating Dr. Blackall and Sir William Dawes, 'men of value and worth,' says Burnet, but holding High Church and Tory opinions.—Stanhope's 'Anne,' p. 316.

² This was on December 7, 1711; in the speech pronounced from the throne, Anne had announced negotiations in favour of a general peace, 'notwithstanding the arts of those who delight in war,' words directed against Marlborough. After unrobing, Anne returned to the House, incognito.—Ibid., p. 500.

³ Hallam, ii. 373.

⁴ Stanhope, pp. 425-426.

Hallam, 'so often talked of, cannot in fact be said to have existed more than two years, from 1708 to 1710.'¹

In the year 1711 the celebrated author, Addison, in conjunction with his friend Richard Steele, began to publish the 'Spectator,' a daily literary journal at the price of one penny. In August, 1712, a stamp was ordered to be impressed on all newspapers of a penny a sheet. The pretext for this measure was the wish to prevent impertinent discussions on public affairs. The price of the 'Spectator' was doubled, and the next year its publication was stopped.²

¹ Hallam, ii. 373.

² See the lately published 'Autobiography of Robert and William Chambers, of Edinburgh,' p. 223. At the same time a tax of a shilling was laid upon every advertisement.

CHAPTER XXXIV.

GEORGE I.

A.D. 1714–1727.

THE new sovereign's arrival marks an important crisis in the succession.

The Stuart dynasty, interrupted only by the period of the Commonwealth with the preceding civil war, continued through the reigns of four kings in the direct line of descent. Those of the sisters Mary and Anne brought it down to 1714, in the collateral line, broken only through the interval by which William survived his queen. And even then, he, as grandson of Charles I., stood nearer to the direct line than the German Elector of Hanover, who, under the Act of Settlement so often mentioned, was now about to take over Anne's crown and sceptre.

'No pretext of absolute right could be advanced on any side,' and George of Hanover derived his best title to the throne from the Act of the British Parliament.¹ Although George was absent, and personally unknown, his accession was proclaimed without a murmur, as if the crown had devolved on a direct heir. The privy council, apprehending opposition, had urged the prince to arrive in England without delay, but the Elector of Hanover does not appear to have shared his mother's eagerness to obtain the important crown of Great Britain; he received the news of the queen's death on August 5, but took time to place his German dominions under the care of his brother, and his apparent indifference under the change led some to believe that he would even have preferred to remain all his life at his little German capital.

The council, which assembled immediately after the death

¹ Hallam's 'Constitutional History,' ii. 343.

of Anne, received a paper, previously prepared, in which the king named those peers who, in conjunction with the seven chief officers of state, should act as lords justices until his arrival in England. The Duke of Marlborough was surprised, it is said, that he was not included in this list of eighteen, nearly all of whom were of the Whig party. Lord Bolingbroke, whose conduct had been thought suspicious, was deprived of the office of secretary of state, to which Lord Townshend succeeded.

On the last day of August the new sovereign left Hanover, accompanied by his son, and landed at Greenwich on September 18, where the principal nobility and clergy pressed forward to greet him. Loyal demonstrations were not less conspicuously exhibited by future conspirators than by his most devoted adherents.¹

George I.—called either the Elector of Hanover, from the chief town of his electorate, or the Elector of Brunswick and Lüneburg, that being the first title of his House—was born on May 28, 1660, one day before the entry of Charles II. into London at the Restoration.

That fervid loyalty which greeted Charles on his arrival at Greenwich was not predominant in 1714, and the German prince had no popular qualifications to awaken it. Fifty-four years of age, with a heavy countenance and slow manner, unable to speak English, and unacquainted with the laws and customs of England, George might well wish rather to defer than to hasten an introduction of which he must have felt the difficulty. His retinue consisted of his German friends and German guards.

It has been said that the Duke of Marlborough was much disappointed at the exclusion of his name from the list of the provisional lords justices. He had returned to England on the day of the queen's death, was warmly received in London, and was kindly recognised by the new sovereign, whom he attended on his entry into the metropolis, and from whom he soon afterwards regained his former offices of captain-general and master of the ordnance.²

The king's coronation on October 20 was attended by all

¹ Lady Mary Wortley Montague, a contemporary, calls George 'an honest block-head,' who would have wished all to enjoy the quiet which he himself loved.—'Letters,' i. 126. Thackeray graphically represents Bishop Atterbury, Marlborough, Oxford, and Bolingbroke, all kneeling to kiss the royal hand.—See 'The Four Georges.'

² Coxe's 'Life of Marlborough,' iii. 377. He was, however, 'admitted to little share in the government of the state, and confined to the routine of his official station.'—Ib., p. 378.

the principal statesmen, even by Oxford and Bolingbroke, and the usual number of loyal addresses were sent from different parts of England. An address, however, soon appeared from the Stuart prince, then residing in Lorraine, asserting his right to the crown of Great Britain, and his conviction that the late queen, his sister, had desired his accession—a declaration accepted by many as proof that the late administration had been unfavourable to the House of Hanover. For a time, both the Irish Catholics and the Scottish Jacobites remained passive, and even Louis XIV., the magnificent patron of James II., sent assurances of his pacific intentions. In January the king opened Parliament in person, the lord chancellor reading the royal speech. Mr. Walpole, who proposed the address in the House of Commons, blamed the late ministers for misguiding the queen, and noticed the declaration of the Pretender.¹ In consequence of this attack, Lord Bolingbroke, after making his last speech in the House of Lords, secretly, at the close of March, left London for France, and publicly joined the Stuart prince. He found the latter already communicating with the Scottish Jacobites, who pressed him to effect a landing upon their coast. The prince was assured that a large part of the English people were inclined to favour him, but that help of both men and arms from France would be needed to render an invasion successful. His principal adherent in England was the Duke of Ormond, who held a kind of opposition court at Richmond, and had undertaken to raise the western counties and to enrol a number of disbanded officers. But after he had laid his plans Ormond's heart failed him, and, without any warning to those who were awaiting his orders, he escaped to France.

The health of Louis XIV. had been rapidly declining, and when, on September 1, he expired, Lord Bolingbroke had no longer any hope of the success of the Chevalier.² There appeared no chance that the French Regent, the Duke of Orleans, would render that aid which Louis XIV. had been formerly ready to afford.³ But although Scotland was not strong enough to act alone, the Earl of Mar had already stirred up rebellion in the Highlands. Mar acted with great duplicity.

¹ According to Coxe, the elevation of Mr. Walpole to the chief post in the administration 'was peculiarly grateful to Marlborough,' who had been Walpole's earliest patron.

² See a quotation from Lord Bolingbroke's letter to Sir William Windham.—Stanhope's History, i. 207.

³ The Duke of Orleans did, however, give the Pretender assistance in his attempt in 1715.—See Hallam, ii. 404, note.

He had joined the Whigs in promoting the Union with England, and on King George's accession sent him a letter containing the warmest professions; but, being deprived of the office which he held under the Tory government, he plunged into intrigues in favour of the exiled family. On August 1 he attended the levée of King George; on the 2nd he departed to raise the Highlands for King James, inviting the principal Jacobites to assemble at a great hunting match to be held on August 27, hunting matches being in those days entertainments which were generally followed by insurrection. Accordingly, when the meeting took place, all present pledged themselves to support the Earl of Mar as the general of King James.

When, on September 6, Mar publicly raised the Chevalier's standard, he had but few followers; but clan after clan assumed the white cockade, the badge of the Stuarts, until the rebellion involved nearly all the North of Scotland. The whole force then at the disposal of the king was little more than 8,000 men. Assistance was, however, procured from Holland, and steps were immediately taken to enrol new regiments. The Duke of Argyle, a hereditary opponent of the Stuarts, took command of the troops at Stirling. Including Irish reinforcements, his army consisted of only 3,300 men, a force far inferior to that under Mar, but of a less mixed kind. In the Scottish army, gentlemen and their servants came equipped with swords and pistols, and were joined by peasants from the Lowlands, and a train of half-naked mountaineers. As one of the Jacobites declared, 'although we had more men, the duke's army had more fire-arms in condition to fire.' On November 13 the battle of Sheriffmuir was fought near Stirling, with much bravery, both sides at first claiming the victory; but the duke held possession of the ground next day, and the number of Scottish trophies showed the government to have been victorious. The clans now soon began to desert Mar's standard, and many chiefs who were hopeless of success tried to make honourable terms of submission.¹ Rumours of defeat promptly arrived in England, and measures were taken against suspected Jacobites. Lords Lansdowne, Duplin, and Powis were sent to the Tower; and, before Parliament adjourned, a message from the king urged the apprehension of six members who were accused of treasonable practices. Guard was placed

¹ Lord Stanhope, i. 257. The Duke of Argyle has received praise for humanity, rarely shown at this period, especially in a civil war. He never refused quarter, and parried with his own sword the blows directed by one of his dragoons against a wounded gentleman who had refused to ask for his life.—Chambers's 'History of the Rebellion,' p. 32.

over Bristol and Plymouth, where hostile preparations had been made—measures completely successful in preventing that rising in the west which Ormond had tried to organise.

But already Lancashire and Northumberland, counties in which the Roman Catholics were numerous, had risen in revolt. These counties obeyed the impulse of the Earl of Derwentwater and Lord Widdrington (Catholics) and of Mr. Forster, member for Northumberland, who, although a Protestant, proclaimed the Chevalier at Warkworth, to the sound of trumpets, and entered Morpeth with 300 men. General Carpenter, who had served in the Spanish war, was sent to Newcastle to oppose the rebels. When, after much hesitation and delay, the Scottish Jacobites resolved to proceed into Lancashire, great apprehensions were felt lest the new English levies might yield to their greater numbers. At Penrith the *posse comitatus*¹ had been called out to meet the rebels by the Bishop of Carlisle and Lord Lonsdale, but the ignorant men who assembled so greatly dreaded the insurgents that they fled at their approach, and the Scots proceeded to Lancaster, everywhere proclaiming King James and obtaining money for their cause. At Preston they were joined by most of the Roman Catholic gentry, who brought with them their servants and tenants, numbering about twelve hundred, but in great measure ill-armed and undisciplined. The king's forces, commanded by Generals Wills and Carpenter, who opposed them, are said not to have numbered more than a thousand men, yet Mr. Forster, the rebel commander, was so fearful of defeat as to propose a capitulation. General Wills promised that if the rebels would lay down their arms and surrender at discretion, he would protect them until he should receive the orders of government.

Many of the Highlanders were highly indignant at this surrender, and threatened a mutiny, but the chief officers induced them to submit, and gave up Lord Derwentwater and Colonel M'Intosh as hostages. Lords Widdrington, Nithsdale, Winton, and others of high rank, were among the captives. The total number who capitulated amounted only to 1,400, by which it appears that many insurgents had previously fled or were in disguise.²

With this capitulation the English part of the insurrection

¹ Literally 'the power of the county.' All men between the ages of fifteen and seventy are, in case of rebellion or invasion, liable to be summoned by the sheriff for the defence of the county.

² 'Mem. de Berwick,' ii. 162, quoted by Lord Stanhope. The surrender at Preston took place nearly on the same day as the Scottish battle at Sheriffmuir.—Stanhope, i. 193

ended; unfortunately, not without its leaders having incurred liability to severe punishment for rebellion.

About 500 captives were sent to prisons in the North of England, and the principal men of rank were brought to London for trial. On their arrival at Highgate, their arms were fastened behind their backs, their horses were led by soldiers, and after an ignominious exhibition in procession, they were sent to the Tower or other places of confinement.

It was not till after the surrender at Preston and the dispersion of his Scottish adherents that, at last, James Stuart, nearly eight years after his former attempt to invade his sister's dominions, again set sail for Scotland. On December 22 he landed at Peterhead in Aberdeenshire, attended but by six persons, one of whom was the Marquis of Tynemouth, son of his relation, the Duke of Berwick. The vessel which conveyed the prince immediately returned to France to assure his friends of his safety.

The prince's landing was unopposed, and on January 6 he entered Dundee in form, attended by the Earl of Mar, whom he created a duke; and, immediately assuming the tone of a sovereign, he established himself at the royal palace of Scone, issued proclamations for a public thanksgiving, and announced that his coronation would take place on the 23rd of the same month. Both the prince and his supporters soon betrayed feelings of disappointment. James is said to have inquired for the Highland chiefs, 'those little kings with their armies,' of whom he had been told, and when one of the most martial clans was paraded before him, he was dismayed at finding the men so few. Those, on the other hand, who had expected the arrival of a daring leader with powerful followers were greatly disappointed. 'At the first news of his landing,' said one of the Jacobite gentlemen at Perth, 'it is impossible to express the joy and vigour of our men.' 'But,' said another adherent, 'when we saw the man whom they called our king, we were not at all animated by his presence, and if he was disappointed in us, we were tenfold more so in him. We saw nothing in him that looked like spirit. Some said the circumstances he found us in, dejected him; I am sure the figure he made dejected us, and had he sent us but 5,000 good soldiers and never come himself amongst us, we had done other things.'¹

James's speech to his council, adverting to his whole life as

¹ 'True Account of the Proceedings at Perth, by a Rebel,' quoted by Lord Stanhope, chap. vi.

a series of misfortunes, breathed far more of resignation than of ardour. It was, however, necessary to circulate it, and in order to check Argyle's advance it was resolved that the villages on the road to Stirling should be burned—a harsh measure, which James is said to have opposed. News of the speedy approach of General Cadogan, one of Marlborough's best officers, caused great perplexity amongst the chiefs, who, in dread that the English might again obtain an easy victory, urged that they should best protect their prince by retreating to the North. The Highland soldiers, eager for battle, obeyed the command to retreat in sullen silence or with cries of indignation.

On January 31 the troops crossed the Tay, which was frozen over, and marched, by Dundee, to Montrose, where James was earnestly advised to re-embark. He is said to have been at first averse to take a step which appeared so ignominious, and to have been finally induced to do so chiefly from fear that by a longer stay he should render his Scottish followers the more liable to severe punishment at the hands of the government. With an attempt at concealment, which recalls his father's flight from London, James, on the evening of February 4, slipped out by a back-door to a private boat, accompanied by Lord Mar and other friends, and was safely put on board a small French vessel in waiting to receive him. He left a commission empowering General Gordon to treat with the English government, and also a letter to the Duke of Argyle requesting him to dispense the sum of money which he enclosed, and which was all that he could spare, in helping to compensate the poor villagers for their burned homes. After a voyage of seven days, so slow was then the transit by sea, James arrived in France, where he met Lord Bolingbroke, with whose advice he disagreed, and whom he removed from his nominal office of secretary of state. Bolingbroke was henceforth no longer a Jacobite. Six noblemen who had been concerned in the rebellion were impeached before the House of Lords and condemned to death. Great interest was felt in England for the fate of men whose only crime was mistaken loyalty, and ladies of high rank accompanied the Countess of Derwentwater to the palace to implore the king's clemency for her husband. George wished to avoid such interviews, but Ladies Nithsdale and Nairn contrived to hide themselves behind a curtain in an ante-chamber through which the king passed and to throw themselves at his feet. Disappointed in that appeal to the sovereign's mercy, Lady Nithsdale tried another stratagem, and on the plea of taking farewell of her

husband in the Tower, she saved his life by an exchange of garments. They happily both escaped and lived together for many years at Rome.¹

Lord Winton also escaped, and the life of Lord Nairn was saved through the interposition of his former friend General Stanhope; but the Earls of Derwentwater and Kenmare suffered death, involving also the confiscation of their properties. The severity with which the leaders of the insurrection were punished did not increase the national affection for the king. Could the Chevalier indeed have adopted the Protestant faith, or had he been more prepossessing in manners and character, he would have been a formidable competitor to such a monarch as George I. Totally ignorant of the English language and customs, cold and reserved, George was constantly showing his predilection for Hanover, whenever it appeared allowable for him to leave England.² Moreover, the disputed succession furnished the Great Powers with means of continual interference with the English government. Notwithstanding King William's objection, a Bill constituting elections for Parliament triennial had been passed in 1694. In 1716, the distracted state of the country and the unpopularity of the government caused the ministers to desire less frequent elections, and they brought forward a Bill to render the Parliamentary term septennial, except in case of dissolution by the crown.

The repeal of 'the Triennial Act,' says Phillimore, 'was a proof that the government felt that a large portion of the people, particularly the country squires and clergymen, were liable to be warped from their allegiance to the House of Hanover.'³ At the king's request, that clause of the Act of Settlement forbidding the sovereign to leave Great Britain without the consent of Parliament was repealed. George was anxious to visit his Hanoverian dominions, and left his son to preside in his absence, with the title of Guardian of the Realm. On his return, the king proposed two conciliatory measures, a considerable reduction in the army, and an Act of Grace in favour of those still in prison on account of the late rebellion. Lord Oxford had been two years in the Tower, from which in

¹ Lord Stanhope gives in the appendix to his second vol. the letter of Lady Nithsdale, describing this successful stratagem.

² Hallam, ii. 419. Also note to 403. Although the government was blamed for severity, 'the execution of two peers and thirty other persons, taken with arms in flagrant rebellion, could scarcely,' says Mr. Hallam, 'be considered unwarrantable. It is said that about 1,000 of those taken in arms submitted to the king's mercy, praying to be sent to the British colonies in North America.'

³ Phillimore's 'History of England,' p. 134.

the previous year he wrote to the Stuart prince, with an offer of his services. On June 27, 1717, he was arraigned in Westminster Hall in the king's presence, but the proceedings were quashed, and he was acquitted without trial. Three Scottish noblemen and many gentlemen of rank were released from custody, as were likewise about two hundred of the prisoners taken at Preston, who were still immured in Chester Castle.

Mr. Skippon, a Jacobite member of Parliament, was sent to the Tower until the end of the session for having asserted that the only infelicity of his Majesty's reign was his want of knowledge of the English language and constitution, an assertion the sting of which lay in its truth. It is said that, owing to the king's incapability of expressing his ideas in English, and to Sir Robert Walpole's ignorance of the French language, the necessary conversation between them was carried on in Latin, a great restriction upon their general discussion of public affairs.¹

The Dissenters, who were well known to be as a class especially loyal to the House of Hanover, were gratified in 1718 by the repeal of the oppressive Acts against 'Occasional Conformity and Schism' which had been passed under Anne. Lord Stanhope wished also to repeal the Test Act, to which the king would have assented; but no further toleration was deemed expedient by Parliament, and that repeal, then deferred until a more favourable opportunity, 'was not effected till the year 1828, when this vestige of former bigotry was removed from the statute-book.'² Family disputes both embittered the king's life and diminished his chances of popularity. He showed great dislike to the Prince of Wales, and on two occasions when he left England for Hanover, placed the government under lords justices instead of committing the regency to the heir-apparent.

Although submitting from necessity to the restrictions of a constitutional king, George I. was despotic in his own family, and claimed the power both of directing the education and of sanctioning the marriages of his grandchildren, which the prince, their father, considered to belong to himself alone. The question was so serious that the lord chancellor asked the collective opinion of the judges. No king of England had lived to have grandsons since the time of Edward III., when the Black Prince had the charge of his son Richard; but the right of disposing of the young members of the royal

¹ Hallam, ii. 455, and note.

² Stanhope's 'History of England,' chap. ix.

family in marriage had generally been assumed by the kings of England. Ten of the judges gave their opinion in favour of the right of the royal grandfather, a decision which much gratified the king.¹ For some time the Pretender had been residing in Italy. In the spring of 1719 he visited Spain, and received encouragement to renew the attempt which had heretofore proved so disastrous to all the abettors of his cause. Notice of an intended invasion was given to the English government in time for the needful measures of defence; but again, as before on like occasions, the winds protected this island from invasion. The Spanish fleet had scarcely lost sight of land when it was scattered far and wide by a tempest which lashed the rough waves of the Bay of Biscay into fury. Two frigates only were able to reach Scotland, on board of which were three Scottish noblemen and about three hundred Spanish soldiers. These forces landed in Ross-shire on April 16, and were joined by a few hundred Highlanders. That the leaders of this hopeless expedition remained for some weeks unassailed, was evidence either of general disaffection to the government, or of popular indifference to so feeble a rebellion. General Carpenter, who commanded the royal forces in Scotland, at length sent a body of troops, which, although far inferior in number to the Spaniards and Highlanders united, quickly defeated them. The Highlanders, swift of foot, and familiar with the mountain passes, mostly escaped to their homes; the Spaniards were compelled to surrender at discretion, and were sent prisoners to Edinburgh. The three noblemen, Lords Tullibardine, Marischal, and Seaforth, succeeded in escaping to the Western Isles, and afterwards reached Spain in disguise; of these, Lord Seaforth received the king's pardon in 1726, and passed the rest of his life quietly in Scotland. Tullibardine reserved his strength for another expedition in the same cause, and at last died in the Tower; the Earl Marischal entered the military service of Prussia.²

The claims of James Stuart to the throne of his ancestors were encouraged in turn for some years by all the principal powers of Europe, who were ready to assist the powerful English faction still desiring his elevation; and the birth of his son Charles Edward at Rome, on the last day of 1720, was hailed with delight by all the friends of the Stuart cause. A conspiracy to aid a Spanish invasion by risings in different

¹ Campbell's 'Lives of the Lord Chancellors,' 'Macclesfield,' vol. iv.

² See Stanhope's 'History of England,' i. chap. x.

parts of England was discovered in 1722, when it became evident that one of the prime movers in the plot was Atterbury, Bishop of Rochester, always an energetic opponent of the Hanoverian government. After examination before the council, on August 24, the bishop was conveyed to the Tower in his own carriage. An absurd declaration was issued by the Pretender from Italy, proposing that if King George would quietly surrender the throne in his favour, he should be secured in the title of King of Hanover by general European consent.

The design of this conspiracy, in which Lords North and Ossory were also concerned, was to raise forces, to gain possession of the Tower, the Bank, and other places of consequence, and then to proclaim King James; but the execution of the plan had been deferred till King George's expected visit to Hanover.¹ The arrest of so distinguished a member of their order greatly irritated High Churchmen. Atterbury pleaded the privileges of a spiritual peer, but it was decided that a bishop, as a Lord of Parliament, was not beyond the jurisdiction of the House of Commons. In March, 1723, a Bill of Pains and Penalties against the bishop passed the House of Lords, which deprived him of all his offices in the Church, and rendered him for ever incapacitated for holding any employment in the king's dominions, for which he was also exiled for life. The evidence against Atterbury was chiefly drawn from letters written by his secretary, and supposed to have been dictated by himself. This was held insufficient for the ordinary modes of trial; accordingly, a parliamentary procedure was adopted, which, like the attainder of Sir John Fenwick in the reign of William, met with severe censure as a mischievous precedent, securing a conviction by a majority in Parliament which might not have been gained by the regular tribunals of the country.² The bishop was brought to the bar of the House of Lords on May 6. He appeared with firmness and dignity, and asserted in his own vindication that, although his bishopric had afforded him only an income of £500 per annum, he had in the course of eight years expended £2,000 in improvements, and dispensed large sums in charity. His character and position interested many in his favour, and Lord Cowper argued that the State ought not to interfere in the degradation of a head of the Church. But the extent of the treason in which Dr. Atterbury was involved, the evidence concerning which

¹ Stanhope's 'History of England,' vol. xii.

² Campbell's 'Lives of the Chancellors,' vol. vi. 'Lord Hardwicke'; and Hallam, ii. 415.

has been confirmed by more recent discoveries, made the punishment of exile rather merciful than severe. The king, however, is said to have reluctantly acquiesced in this verdict. Soon after the bishop's departure he went to Paris, and continued during some years to join in fruitless schemes for the restoration of the Stuart dynasty.

The prevailing discontent against the government had been increased by peculiar internal troubles affecting public credit. During the latter part of Anne's reign, the South Sea Company had been founded by Harley, Earl of Oxford, and others, an enterprise which allured shareholders by the promise of large profits from trade with the coasts of America possessed by Spain. A Royal Charter and an Act of Parliament sanctioned the project, and many persons who were completely ignorant of the chances of success became involved in the speculation. There was also an 'Indian Company' set up at Paris by a Scotsman named Law, and many persons of high rank in both France and England had been seized with a wild enthusiasm for commercial gambling. Walpole endeavoured in vain to show the danger of these schemes. At length, in 1721, the 'bubble' burst, and, to soothe the indignation of the sufferers, a Bill was hurried through Parliament which obliged the directors to declare the exact value of their estates. They were disabled from holding any office or sitting in future Parliaments, and their estates, which were collectively valued at £2,000,000 sterling, were confiscated for the relief of the injured.¹ Popular indignation with some of the ministers who had been concerned in this unfortunate company induced the king to confide the chief direction of affairs to Sir Robert Walpole, who, during the remainder of this reign, and for about fifteen years of the next, enjoyed an ascendancy unequalled by any other man in England. During the continual absence of the king, who had but little personal authority or knowledge of the country, it was to England's lasting benefit that she was ruled by a statesman of such rectitude and justice, and so attentive to the interests of commerce.² Power at that period mainly rested with the House of Commons, which was little controlled by the sovereign, and far less than now under the influence of the people, who were not then apprised by daily reports of the

¹ Stanhope's History, ii. 17-22. At the investigation of the concern a mass of infamous corruption was discovered. Above half a milliom of fictitious South Sea Stock had been created, large portions of which had been conferred upon the Duchess of Kendal, a German favourite of the king's, and on others of his adherents, in order to obtain the Act of Parliament in favour of the project.

² Hallam, ii. 415-463; Macaulay's 'Essay on Walpole's Letters.'

speeches made by those who were called their representatives. The degree of influence which Walpole exerted over the House of Commons formed afterwards the chief accusation against him, but it appears to have been mainly used for good purposes. In 1724 he was created by the king a Knight of the Bath, and received the higher honour of the Garter in 1726, a distinction which has been scarcely ever bestowed in modern times upon a commoner.¹

The year 1725 was memorable on account of the punishment of the lord chancellor, Parker, Earl of Macclesfield. The abuses practised by the Court of Chancery had attracted general notice; it was said that the offices of the masters were put up for sale, and that the money of the suitors and the estates of widows and orphans had been wasted by private speculation. Like the great Lord Bacon, who fell a hundred years before under the weight of similar accusations, Lord Macclesfield had been respected in his high position, and was a steady friend of civil and religious liberty. He was, however, unable to refute the aspersions to which he was exposed, and after he had surrendered the Great Seal in January, 1725, he was impeached by the House of Commons, and subjected to a long trial in the House of Lords which excited intense interest. The principal charges against Lord Macclesfield were, that he had sold masterships in Chancery, had received large sums of money on the transfer of offices, and that he had connived at the fraudulent practice of masters who paid for their places out of the funds left in their hands by suitors. An attempt was made to vindicate his conduct by citing similar examples; but only three former instances of the sale of the office of master appeared on record, and these were transactions for much smaller sums, which the parties had defrayed themselves without touching the money of the suitors. At the close of the long trial, the unanimous verdict pronounced by the ninety-three peers present was, 'Guilty of high crimes and misdemeanours,' and on May 27, Lord Macclesfield knelt to receive the sentence, read by Lord Chief Justice King, soon afterwards chancellor,—that he should pay a fine of £30,000 to the king, and be imprisoned in the Tower until payment thereof. He remained in confinement for six weeks while making arrangements for the payment of the fine. The king, who had felt much obliged to Lord Macclesfield for sustaining his claim to the care of his grandchildren, signified his readiness to pay the amount of the fine by instalments,

¹ Stanhope's History, ii., small edition, p. 76.

and £1,000 was transmitted, but the further supplies which had been promised were stopped by the king's sudden death; while that conduct which had won the especial favour of George I. was certain to have rendered the ex-chancellor obnoxious to his son. Lord Macclesfield, after his sentence, entirely withdrew from public life, and interested himself in the education of his son, who became remarkable as a man of science.

The king, who had again left England at the beginning of June, 1727, was struck by apoplexy, and was but just able to reach the residence of his brother, the Bishop of Osnabrück, before he expired. He was interred at Hanover, in the vault of his ancestors. The praise accorded to this sovereign, as a man 'upright, honourable, and benevolent, steady in his friendships, and a lover of peace'¹ (a character which leaves little more to be desired in a constitutional king), appears scarcely compatible with his temper and conduct towards his more affable and popular heir. His unfortunate wife, the Princess Sophia of Zell, on account of certain suspicions disbelieved by her son, yet probably but too well justified, was confined by her husband's orders in the solitary castle of Ahlden during thirty-two years, an imprisonment at length ended by her death, a few months only before his own.² Murmurs were excited in England by the large gifts which the king conferred on the German lady to whom he gave the title of Duchess of Kendal. It is said to have been by means of a bribe of £11,000, given to the duchess by the French wife of Lord Bolingbroke, that permission was at length obtained by that nobleman in 1724 to return to England, where he was allowed to take possession of his estates, but not to re-enter the House of Lords.

The people of Hanover and their prince had been mutually attached, and the visits which King George made to his electorate were happy occasions on both sides. Although despotic in his German state, he is believed to have conducted its affairs with much prudence. It was quite natural that he should have far less sympathy with his English subjects, whom he could not understand, and in whose attachment he had little reason to believe. But under his rule Great Britain was independent of foreign powers; under a Stuart it would have sunk into subservience to France. There could have been no English liberty under a king who received the patronage and the orders of Louis XIV. 'The German Protestant,' says Mr. Thackeray,

¹ See Stanhope's History, chap. iv.

² *Ib.*, vol. ii., small edition. This unfortunate princess was never known by any title but that of the Electress of Hanover, or 'The Lady of Ahlden.'

‘was a cheaper, better, and kinder king than the Catholic Stuart in whose chair he sate, and so far loyal to England, that he let England govern herself.’ Since the revolution of 1688, ‘an immense power had been thrown into the scale of Parliament.’ ‘The nation, which had been exhausted by the long wars of William and Anne, recovered strength in the thirty years of peace that ensued; and in that period especially,’ says Hallam, ‘under the prudent rule of Walpole, the seeds of our commercial greatness were gradually ripened.’¹

The illustrious philosopher Sir Isaac Newton died at Kensington about three months before the death of George I. His company had been courted by the highest persons in society, including the Princess of Wales, afterwards Queen Caroline, and his funeral at Westminster Abbey, which was conducted with great pomp, was regarded with much interest by Voltaire, at that time an exile, and unaccustomed to see such honours awarded to purely scientific eminence.

¹ ‘Constitutional History,’ ii. 426-463.

CHAPTER XXXV.

GEORGE II.

A.D. 1727-1760.

THE Prince of Wales was residing at Richmond Palace, when, on June 14, 1727, Sir Robert Walpole unexpectedly came up to inform him of his father's death, and he immediately ascended the throne without opposition. He was forty-four years of age, small in person and undignified in demeanour; but the absence of that reserve which distinguished the late king enhanced his popularity, and he possessed the great advantage of speaking English fluently, although with a foreign accent. When serving under Marlborough at Oudenarde, he had convinced everybody of his courage; he was, moreover, temperate, methodical, and fond of business. The new queen (Caroline, Princess of Anspach) possessed in a far greater degree the attractive qualities befitting her station, and by her dignified conduct and the happy influence which she soon exercised, added greatly to the popularity of the House of Hanover. She was fond of the society of learned men, and desirous to patronise merit, but was on her guard not to take the lead of her less-gifted husband.¹

The king was inclined to gratify his private resentment by displacing his father's prime minister; but the queen gently represented that it would be impolitic to dismiss a successful and well-established administration, and Walpole remained in office and in enjoyment of Queen Caroline's friendship. The Jacobites, who had hoped that confusion would ensue on the death of George I., were disappointed at the revived spirit of loyalty which accompanied a fresh dawn of general prosperity. The king's declaration that he would make no distinction of parties, and the dismissal of the

¹ Stanhope's History, ii. 113, small edition.

German followers of the court, advanced George in the public estimation at the beginning of his reign.

The French government, urged by the English ministry, sent positive directions to James Stuart to leave Lorraine, and he again set up his little court in Italy. The Jacobites consequently being no longer supported by any foreign power, knew that an insurrection would be hopeless, and from 1728 to 1740 their cause fell out of public notice. Its subsequent revival was the consequence of French retaliation when England was occupied with war.¹

Bishop Atterbury died at Paris in the beginning of 1732, and his remains were brought to England for interment at Westminster Abbey. The secrecy with which the business of Parliament was conducted at this period is proved by the treatment of Raikes, a printer at Gloucester, who had ventured to publish an account of their proceedings, which the House of Commons declared to be a breach of the peace, and it threatened to punish any printer or publisher who should offend in like manner in future.²

Sir Robert Walpole's ascendancy promoted general peace in Europe, and consequently the prosperity of England. Among the beneficial measures adopted was an order for the use of English in courts of law instead of the Latin language; there was also some mitigation of the cruel treatment of criminals in gaols.

In the autumn of 1736 an alarming riot occurred in Edinburgh.³ Two notorious smugglers named Wilson and Robertson, who were confined in the Tolbooth prison and sentenced to death, made an attempt to escape through a window, which proved unsuccessful, as Wilson was too stout to pass between the bars. Aware that Robertson might have extricated himself had he been the first to make the attempt, Wilson resolved to make a desperate effort to liberate his friend, and when the prisoners were led the next Sunday to church, he grappled so strongly with the guard that Robertson succeeded in escaping. Wilson's execution took place, as arranged, on April 14, attended by a large number of the city guard under the command of Captain Porteous, an officer obnoxious to the people on account of his severity.

¹ Stanhope, ii. 139.

² Mr. Raikes was summoned to attend the House, but was afterwards excused on the plea of illness; also because the paragraph complained of was inserted in his journal without his knowledge.—'Parl. Hist.,' 1729, p. 632; and Lord Mahon, vii. 493.

³ Described by Sir Walter Scott in the well-known 'Heart of Midlothian.'

The act had been performed, when an effort was made to seize the body ; some of the populace throwing stones at the executioner and the soldiers, which so enraged Porteous that he fired into the crowd, and killed a man ; the soldiers followed his example, six or seven persons were slain, and many others wounded.

The public indignation was loud against Porteous ; he was tried before the High Court of Justiciary, and was sentenced to be executed on September 8.

The sentence was referred to the queen, who was then at the head of the Regency during the king's absence in Germany. Violent and unjustifiable as Porteous's conduct had been, yet in an impartial view it could hardly amount to a capital offence, and the queen sent down a reprieve.¹ The people of Edinburgh, however, could not be satisfied without the fulfilment of the sentence, and the arrival of the reprieve inflamed them to madness. They resolved to execute the full vengeance which their own court had prescribed ; disarmed the city guard, and, taking up their weapons, attacked the outer door of the Tolbooth with extreme violence. Wearied with the resistance of that barrier, they had determined to set fire to the gaol when the terrified gaoler flung out to them the keys. They soon got possession of the wretched Porteous, dragged him to the Grass-market, and hanged him upon a dyer's pole. The orderly deliberation with which this act of vengeance was perpetrated proved that the rioters were above the rank of the populace.

The government were extremely indignant at this breach of the law ; but so great was the sympathy of Edinburgh with the perpetrators, that their names could not be obtained either by promises of reward or threats of punishment, and no course appeared open except to dismiss the lord provost for the carelessness of his conduct, and to impose on the city a fine of £20,000, to be paid to the unhappy widow of Porteous.

The beneficial influence which Queen Caroline might have exercised over English society was lessened by the estrangement from both his parents of Frederick, Prince of Wales, who, although weak and vain in character, professed to be a friend to literature, and opened his house to all the men of wit and genius who took the opposition side. Lord Chesterfield, Sir William Wyndham, and other Tories, were the prince's intimate friends, and the disaffected Lord Bolingbroke was his political guide.²

¹ Porteous denied that he had fired with a murderous aim.

² Dean Swift was one of this circle, and high in the favour of the Princess of Wales, in spite of the uncourtliness of 'Gulliver's Travels.' In the years 1731 and

On the prince's marriage, in April, 1736, to Augusta of Saxe-Gotha, an attractive princess, it was vainly hoped that concord might have been restored. The unexpected death of Queen Caroline, on November 20, 1737, after a short illness, was much deplored both by the king and the nation. When taking leave of the king and his principal adherents, the queen is said to have entreated Walpole never to desert the service of his royal master.¹ During the ten years of Queen Caroline's ascendancy it is said that no appointments were made, either in the Church or the State, without her advice, yet she acted rather by suggesting ideas which the king might believe to be his own than by directly opposing him in argument. The disunion in the royal family, however, tended to weaken the party of the Pretender, since Tories could anticipate their return to power whenever Frederick should succeed to his father's throne.

English traders had long complained of the grievances which they suffered from the Spanish colonists in South America. A cry for war with Spain was encouraged by the opposition, and became so strong that, in 1739, Sir Robert Walpole yielded to it against his own judgment. Indignation against those who had injured English subjects was stimulated by golden dreams of future profits from the acquisition of the rich mines of South America. So eager were the citizens of London to engage in war with Spain, that on the day when it was announced the bells pealed from every steeple, and, amidst the shouts and acclamations of the multitude, the Prince of Wales stopped at Temple Bar to drink success to England in the approaching strife of arms. However popular a war may be at its commencement, the people are soon wearied by the sacrifices which it requires. Seamen were difficult to procure in sufficient numbers, and the forcible seizure of sailors on board merchant vessels aroused popular indignation. Indeed, when Sir George Anson, afterwards celebrated for his voyage round the world, undertook to lead an expedition against the Spanish settlements in Peru, notwithstanding his representations of their inability to endure the difficulties of the enterprise, about 250 of the out-pensioners of Chelsea Hospital were pressed into the service. Great was the mortality before the vessels reached

1732 the 'London' and the 'Gentleman's' Magazines were first established, in which the speeches of the chief orators in Parliament were given under feigned names by Dr. Johnson and other writers then beginning their career.—Campbell's 'Chancellors,' iv. 515.

¹ Stanhope, ii. 208, small edition.

the beautiful isle of Juan Fernandez, the appointed place of meeting.¹

Anson gained possession of Payta, a town of Peru, containing valuable merchandise and treasure, and, sailing on towards China, after long delay he succeeded in capturing one of the rich Spanish treasure-ships with a million and a half of dollars from the Philippine Islands on board. Returning by the Cape of Good Hope, he reached England in June, 1743, after an absence of four years. The voyage round the world which he had thus achieved, although of no political importance, redounded to the credit of the country, and he was accordingly raised to the peerage.

The narrative of Lord Anson's 'Voyage round the World' was read with eagerness, and was translated into several languages. An expedition under Admiral Vernon to attack the eastern coast of South America had proved a failure, the lives of more Englishmen being sacrificed from the unhealthy tropical climate than from the hostility of the colonists.

Sir Robert Walpole had been averse to the war from the beginning; but when it became unpopular, and injurious to commerce, the outcry against him grew so violent that he found it necessary to resign his post. The Prince of Wales, indeed, as well as the wits and men of letters, indignant at the want of patronage at court, from various motives formed part of this hostile coalition. The king accepted his resignation with regret, and declared that he was determined to stand by those adherents who had placed the House of Hanover on the throne; he therefore immediately raised Sir Robert to the peerage, with the title of Earl of Orford.

A cry was raised in Parliament against the corruption practised by the fallen minister, and on March 9, it was proposed that a select committee should inquire into the administration over which Sir Robert had presided for the last twenty years. The motion was lost by a majority of only two. A few days afterwards the attack was renewed, the inquiry being limited to the last ten years, and was fiercely pressed by the rising orator, William Pitt. This remarkable man, having first entered Parliament seven years before as member for the

¹ Stanhope, ii. 282. Juan Fernandez was then uninhabited. It was the abode for five years of Alexander Selkirk, upon whose adventures Defoe founded the popular tale of 'Robinson Crusoe.' Thirty-two years had passed since Selkirk had left the island, but an old goat is said to have been caught which bore his mark, and many of the seamen were restored to health by the excellent water, goats' milk, and wild herbs.

notorious rotten borough of Old Sarum, had strongly opposed Walpole, for which he was dismissed from his cornetcy in the Blues, but was shortly after appointed groom of the bed-chamber to the Prince of Wales.¹

The motion having been carried by a majority of seven, a committee of inquiry was appointed to search the books of the Treasury for proofs of Walpole's guilt, and to summon before itself those persons who were supposed to have been his secret agents. The party animosity with which the inquiry was conducted disgusted several members of the committee, and some refused to give evidence which might also have criminated themselves; whereupon a Bill to indemnify those who should bring evidence against the Earl of Orford was passed by the House of Commons, but rejected by a large majority of the House of Lords, and a motion which was made in the following session for renewing the inquiry was also defeated. From the time of his elevation to the peerage till his death at his seat in Norfolk, in 1745, Lord Orford took little part in public affairs. 'There must,' said the late Sir Robert Peel when writing of Walpole, 'have been something very extraordinary in the character and powers of that man, who, being the son of a private gentleman, was prime minister of England amid great public difficulties for a period of twenty years, who mainly by his personal exertions contributed to establish and confirm without severity, without bloodshed, a new and unpopular dynasty, who tolerated no competitor for power, and was emphatically the minister of England.'² The charges of corruption which were repeatedly brought against him were unsubstantiated, but the venality of his predecessors was well known.

While Walpole deprecated the war with Spain, a great contest was approaching in Germany, in which England was soon involved. The Emperor of Germany, Charles VI., so long a competitor for the Spanish throne, died in the year 1740, leaving by a decree, approved by his council and called 'the Pragmatic Sanction,' all his hereditary dominions to his daughter, Maria Theresa. The title of Emperor of Germany was determined by election, and could not be given to a princess.³

¹ Lord Stanhope's History, iii. 11 and 120. The Duke of Bolton and Lord Cobham were also deprived of their commissions, by Walpole's influence, on account of their politics.

² See Sir Robert Peel's correspondence with Lord Mahon, in 'Stanhope Miscellanies,' p. 68.

³ Charles VI., last male descendant of the House of Austria, promulgated, under

Maria Theresa was twenty-three years of age, high-spirited, and attractive in demeanour, but her husband, Francis, Grand Duke of Tuscany, was a man of no intellectual vigour. The great object of the late emperor had long been to provide for his daughter's succession to the many hereditary crowns of the House of Hapsburg, and all the principal powers of Europe had bound themselves by treaty to maintain the arrangement. Guarantees, however, were quickly disregarded: France and Spain formed a compact for the dismemberment of the vast empire of Germany, and their ally, the Elector of Bavaria, advanced against Vienna without opposition.

The young queen's most formidable adversary was Frederick of Prussia, who inherited his small kingdom in the same year, and immediately revived a former claim to part of the province of Silesia. He offered terms: if Maria Theresa would at once cede to him Lower Silesia, he would employ his excellent army in her defence, and would aid in placing the imperial crown of Germany upon her husband's head. She refused to surrender any part of her dominions; on which he immediately turned his arms against Silesia, and in a few weeks nearly reduced the whole province. England was anxious to assist the injured Queen of Hungary. Supported both by the Parliament and people, Walpole proposed to send her a subsidy of £300,000 and a force of 12,000 men. But the resolution was abandoned owing to the fears entertained by King George for the safety of his beloved electorate. He passed the summer of 1741 at Hanover, and was so greatly alarmed by the approach of the French troops, that in September he concluded a hasty treaty, promising that for the next year he would neither aid Maria Theresa nor support the election of her husband to the imperial throne. This treaty was much condemned in England as selfish and pusillanimous, and complaints were raised that Hanover was more to the king than England. Supported by a large French army, the Elector of Bavaria caused himself to be appointed Duke of Austria; while Maria Theresa left Vienna to throw herself upon the loyalty of the most noble-minded of her subjects, the high-spirited Hungarians.

In June she had been crowned at Presburg, and had promised to confirm the privileges of Hungary. In September the

the name of the Pragmatic Sanction, a new law of succession, by virtue of which his daughter, wife of Francis of Lorraine, succeeded to the hereditary dominions of her ancestors.—See Macaulay's Essay on 'Frederick the Great.' 'That instrument was placed under the protection of the public faith of the whole civilized world.'

queen appeared there as a fugitive, in deep mourning, with the crown of St. Stephen upon her head, and held up before the assembled nobles her infant son, afterwards the Emperor Joseph II. ; addressing them in Latin, which she spoke fluently, and in which language the national deliberations were always held. Her speech was an earnest appeal for help :—‘ The kingdom of Hungary, our person, our children, our crown, are at stake ! Forsaken by all, we seek shelter in the fidelity, the hereditary valour of the renowned Hungarian States.’ As if animated by one common impulse, the whole assembly, with their swords half-drawn, exclaimed, ‘ We will die for our king, Maria Theresa.’¹ All shed tears of affection and indignation, and withdrew to concert the necessary measures to meet the national emergency. The magnates called in their wild soldiery from the remotest provinces, and soon assembled an army of considerable numbers round the royal standard. The French and Bavarians were defeated by the Austrian general at Linz, and although the court of sovereigns at Frankfort elected Charles of Bavaria Emperor of Germany, his hereditary states fell into the possession of his foes.²

Although apprehensions of a French invasion had impelled King George to the hasty conclusion of the treaty of Hanover, he was afterwards desirous for Hanover also to take a prominent part in the war. Yet, at the opening of Parliament in 1742, loud murmurs greeted the announcement in the king’s speech that 16,000 Hanoverian soldiers were to support the cause of the Queen of Hungary, when it was found that the cost of these soldiers would be paid by the English treasury. Mr. Pitt, whose uncourtly language was unsuited to an expectant minister, declared it ‘ apparent that this great, powerful, and formidable kingdom ’ was to be held ‘ only as a province to a miserable electorate ; ’ nevertheless, on proceeding to a division, the Ministry triumphed over the Opposition.³ King George soon availed himself of an opportunity to prove his personal courage in the field. In June, 1743, he and his second son, William, Duke of Cumberland, went from Hanover to join the allied army, and on the 27th encountered a superior force

¹ Stanhope, iii. 85. The Hungarians always called their female sovereign their king.

² The nomination of the Elector of Bavaria as Emperor of Germany occurred in the same week as Sir Robert Walpole’s resignation. Charles VII. died in 1745, after which, Francis, the husband of Maria Theresa, was elected Emperor of Germany.—Ib., iii. 88, 192, and 199.

³ Ib., iii. 138.

of French at Dettingen, the last occasion upon which a King of England has commanded in person in the field.¹

According to accounts generally credited, the king and his son both displayed great courage in this engagement, and contributed greatly to the victory obtained over the French. The horse on which the king rode was so terrified by the onset as to bring his Majesty into considerable peril; but he dismounted, and, drawing his sword, put himself at the head of the British and Hanoverian infantry. Frederick of Prussia, who disliked his cousin, the King of England, caricatured the attitude assumed by George as that of a fencing-master about to make a thrust.² The victory in which the English monarch bore so great a part was not followed by any decisive results, and before the end of the year the king returned to England, again to experience the unpopularity which attended every mention of the Hanoverian connection. The petty strife of hostile parties was soon, however, to be again quenched in a far greater contest.³

Irritated by their recent defeat, the French government resolved to try once more the experiment of a Jacobite invasion. By a treaty signed at Worms in September, England and Sardinia had pledged themselves to co-operate with Austria; and to this convention the French now opposed an alliance offensive and defensive with Spain. Agreeably to the invitation of the French minister, Charles Edward, son of the old Pretender James Stuart, secretly proceeded in January, 1744, from Rome to Paris, encountering much risk of capture. The young prince was in his twenty-fourth year, handsome, strong and active, and eager to risk his life in an attempt to place his father on the throne of his ancestors. While awaiting the promised assistance of his French and Scottish friends, Charles Edward remained for some time at Gravelines, near Dunkirk, in strict privacy, within sight of the white cliffs of that island over which he hoped one day to rule. Once again, at the beginning of May, the violence of the winds protected the shores of England. The French squadrons were already advancing up the British Channel, and the prince and the Maréchal de Saxe had embarked to command the expedition, when a violent storm came up, blowing directly on Dunkirk, which caused the destruction of some of

¹ Stanhope, iii. 150.

² *Ib.* note.

³ The demand for newspapers was constantly increasing, and continual attempts were made to evade paying the halfpenny or penny stamp. In 1743 an Act was passed subjecting any newsman who offered unstamped papers for sale to three months' imprisonment.

the largest ships with their crews, and obliged the rest to return into harbour. Charles Edward was extremely reluctant to abandon the enterprise, but the French ministry was discouraged, the *maréchal* was called away, and the prince's proposal to embark for Scotland in a small fishing-vessel receiving no encouragement, he returned to Paris to wait the turn of events, which again favoured French enterprise in the spring of 1745. On May 11 the French, commanded by the *Maréchal de Saxe*, defeated the allied English, Dutch, and Hanoverian army at Fontenoy, in the Netherlands. The Duke of Cumberland, one of the commanders, proved himself a gallant officer, and the number of the slain was so nearly equal on both sides that it might be considered by the allies 'rather a disappointment than a defeat.'¹

Charles Edward had remained at Paris, harassed by the want of union among his own adherents, and by the fickle friendship of Louis XV., who showed little of the ardour with which his grandfather had advocated the Stuart cause. The prince's impatience to renew his enterprise was encouraged by the recent French victory in spite of the prudent doubts suggested by Scottish adherents, who urged that for him to land in Scotland, without the support of a large body of foreign troops, would be 'the extreme of rashness.' Whilst Charles Edward was negotiating for the sale of his jewels, even declaring his readiness to pawn his shirt for arms and ammunition, his Scottish friends trembled at the risk, and, aware of the impending calamities, stationed a trusty adherent to watch the Highland coast, with instructions that should the prince attempt a landing he should be urged, if possible, immediately to return.² Agreeably to these instructions, Murray watched the west coast during the whole month of June, when, as there was still no sign, he conceived that the enterprise had been abandoned. Meantime the Stuart prince, with the help of seven friends who had resolved to risk their lives in his cause, had secretly engaged a small vessel. Their intentions were concealed through fear of opposition from the French government. At length, in July, the prince embarked at the mouth of the Loire, disguised as a Scottish student from Paris, his rank being unknown to the crew. The arms which he had provided were mostly on board a ship-of-war called the 'Elizabeth,' which, being attacked by an English vessel on the way, was forced to return to France.

The prince's vessel, the 'Dentelle,' was chased by another

¹ Stanhope, iii. 197.

² *Ib.*, p. 203 ; and Chambers's 'History of the Rebellion,' p. 19.

ship, but after a fortnight's voyage found a secure anchorage among the little Western Isles. Saved from the perils of the ocean, there was yet little room for congratulation, as the first Highland chieftain who came on board remonstrated with Charles against an enterprise which he declared to be rash to the verge of insanity. On July 25 the prince entered a bay on the coast of Inverness, and asked the chiefs of the district for their aid, but again in the first instance was met with expressions of dismay.

But the earnestness with which he pleaded his cause, the fascination of his manner, and the interest excited by his enterprise, kindled the enthusiasm of a younger Macdonald, and elicited the necessary promise of support from the whole of that clan.¹ Attachment and admiration for the young descendant of their ancient kings overpowered the chieftains' natural apprehensions for the security of their children's inheritance. Others still held back with numerous followers, preparing to side with the party which might be eventually successful. The prince appointed August 19 the day for raising the standard at Glenfinnan, a desolate and lonely vale about fifteen miles from Fort William. When Charles Edward arrived at the appointed time, attended by some of the Macdonalds, expecting to find a large gathering, he was totally disappointed. After waiting for two hours, he was cheered by the notes of the pibroch and the coming of Lochiel with about 600 Camerons, many of them without weapons, but conducting two English companies whom they had taken prisoners on their way to reinforce the garrison of Fort William.²

The Marquis of Tullibardine, brother of the Duke of Athol, who would himself have succeeded to the dukedom had he not been concerned in the rebellion of 1715, then displayed the Stuart banner of red silk, on which the words 'Tandem triumphans,' were afterwards inscribed. The aged marquis read the manifesto of the old Chevalier, and the commission of regency entrusted to the prince, and Charles, after declaring his determination to conquer or die, dismissed the captain of the English prisoners, desiring him to inform his general of what he had seen, and to say that the prince would soon be at hand to meet him in the field.

¹ The cluster of islands through which the prince's vessel reached the mainland of Scotland belonged to Macdonald of Clanranald. The chief was usually known by the territorial name.

² After the suppression of the Stuart insurrection in 1715 three forts had been erected by the government, those of Inverness, Fort William, and Fort Augustus. No efforts had been made to conciliate the Highlanders.

The slow communication of these times, little more than a century before our own, appears almost unaccountable. It was on July 25 that the prince landed. The news of his arrival reached London on the 30th, and the secretary for Scotland took measures to apprise the authorities of Edinburgh. But so late as August 8 no news had been received at the Scottish capital, and Sir John Cope, the chief in command, had only about 3,000 men, a force which he, nevertheless, calculated would prove sufficient to repress a Highland rebellion.¹

To his surprise, Cope found the mountain pass of Corry-Arrach occupied by the prince's followers, and the Highlanders exulted when the general changed his route. Unopposed at present, the prince reached Blair, the seat of the Duke of Athol, who retired at his approach, while Tullibardine, called Duke of Athol by the Jacobites, took feudal possession of his ancestral halls. The Highlanders were charmed by the lofty stature, strength, and energy of the young prince, who willingly adopted the hardy habits of his adherents, and quickly learned a few words of Gaelic, of which he made good use.

Charles desired nothing better than to repose at night upon the open moor with no other shelter than his plaid. As he marched along he listened with pleasure to the old legends or national songs, and there is scarcely on record any instance of a chieftain who so rapidly gained the hearts of his followers. But the Lowlanders were of another race, and seldom saw the wild Highlanders except when they drove their cattle from the mountains, or ventured upon forays into the agricultural districts. The citizens of Edinburgh, too long distrustful of the extent of the insurrection, became suddenly terrified when a body of dragoons retreated to the city from the attack of the skirmishers preceding the prince's army, and the provost hastily called the magistrates together to decide whether Edinburgh should be defended. Afraid to resist, yet ashamed to yield, the magistrates attempted to negotiate and gain time, but a strong party of the Highland army having contrived to enter the city, the prince, on September 17, gained quiet possession of the capital of Scotland. The citizens, who looked upon Highlanders as barbarians, must have been surprised by the perfect order maintained by these troops, who obeyed the word of their officers with the utmost strictness.

¹ All the dates are given by Lord Stanhope and others in the old style, by which the English calendar was still regulated, although the French had adopted the new mode.

The heralds, arrayed in their antique dresses, proclaimed the father of the young prince as 'King James VIII.,' and read his royal declaration, whilst the bagpipes sounded, and white ribbons were distributed as the badge of the House of Stuart. The prince appeared in a tartan suit and blue bonnet, with a white cockade and the star of St. Andrew, and entered the long-deserted palace of Holyrood, where he held that evening a splendid ball. After spending a day at Edinburgh, he led forth his troops to meet the advance of Sir John Cope, over whose forces, near the village of Preston, he obtained a complete victory. There, indeed, he displayed both bravery in the field and humanity towards the vanquished. The standards, and the military chest, containing about £2,500, were brought to Charles. The smaller spoils were distributed among the conquerors, some of whom were utterly ignorant of their value. A Highlander sold a watch for a trifle, declaring that he was 'glad to get rid of the creature since it had died,' the mechanism having stopped for want of being wound up.¹ The terrific yell raised by the Highlanders, and their impetuous charge, so terrified the royal dragoons that they continued in retreat till they reached the ramparts of Berwick. Nearly 400 men fell on the side of the English; on the other side the loss was trifling, and Charles wrote to his father that it had been one of the most surprising actions ever fought. The prince called it the battle of Gladsmuir, from an extensive heath about a mile from the place of conflict; on account of an old prophecy, the government party called it the battle of Preston-pans. On the succeeding day, which was Sunday, the prince entered Edinburgh in triumph, the bag-pipes playing the favourite tune, 'The king shall enjoy his own again.' Few of the clergy were present. They mostly desisted from preaching whilst the prince remained in Edinburgh; and, fearing the resentment of both parties, tried to avoid offering the customary prayer for the king. The Lowlanders, who were mostly Presbyterians, had no sympathy with the prince; and although he had so easily obtained entrance into Edinburgh, the castle still held out for the government, and only about 300 of the citizens, 'those not being the most respectable,' paid the prince the compliment of wearing the white cockade. The religious persecution, from which the Scottish Protestants had so greatly suffered, had left behind bitter remembrances connected with the Stuart kings.² But after the victory at

¹ Stanhope, iii. 241.

² Chambers's 'History of the Rebellion,' p. 137.

Preston-pans the prince appeared to be the master of all Scotland, excepting some districts beyond Inverness, the forts in the Highlands, and the castles of Edinburgh and Stirling. King James VIII. was proclaimed in almost every Scottish town, and money was exacted for the cause, £5,000 being levied as the contribution of Glasgow, that being both the wealthiest city and the least friendly to the insurrection.

Charles was now eager to prosecute his victory by an immediate march upon London, but was dissuaded by his friends, who pleaded the necessity of awaiting the promised aid from France, since many of his Highland adherents had hastened to their mountain homes immediately after the battle, to secure the spoils of war. The prince despatched an agent into Northumberland, exhorting his friends to prepare money and provisions for his speedy arrival, and declaring that the word should be 'Now or Never,' as he was resolved to conquer or die. At Holyrood, Charles exercised the functions of a regent. In a proclamation of October 9, he denounced 'the pretended Parliament of the Elector of Hanover,' by which title he uniformly designated King George of England, and he declared his conviction that King James would cancel the Union, which he found still so unpopular. King George had returned from Hanover on receiving the first news of the insurrection, and arrived in London on August 31. Some English regiments at present in Flanders were recalled, and the Dutch were required to send auxiliaries; but, until the English forces had been routed at Preston-pans, little apprehension appears to have been felt.¹ The arrival of French vessels bringing large sums of money, arms, and French and Irish officers, and the addition of numerous Scottish volunteers, some of whom were of high rank, strengthened the prince's determination to advance into England and to risk an encounter with Marshal Wade, who was stationed at Newcastle, in command of the English army. The Scottish chiefs, though more aware of the peril, at length yielded to his wish. Deceiving the English commanders by a feigned descent upon Northumberland, the prince, after a siege of a few days, on November 17, entered Carlisle in triumph.

But although the possession of this ancient bulwark of the northern counties inspired some confidence in his success, there were many signs discouraging to the Stuart cause. The prince had no sooner left Scotland than the chief trading towns inclined to resume allegiance to the House of Hanover. The

¹ Stanhope, iii. 244-259.

inhabitants of the south of Scotland, mostly Presbyterian in faith, had been lately reaping the profits of peace. When the Earl of Kilmarnock sought to raise soldiers from his own town, from which his father, in the insurrection of 1715, obtained a regiment, it was in vain that he called upon the townsmen to join in the enterprise. They were profitably employed in the manufacture of carpets and other articles, and but one follower is said to have answered to his appeal.¹ The principal recruits came from the Roman Catholic districts, but many of the chiefs were cautious, some treacherous. Lord Lovat, who recalled his son from college to take the command of his clan on the prince's behalf, at the same time endeavoured to keep up the appearance of loyalty towards King George. Many Highlanders were unwilling to carry the war out of Scotland; the roads near the border swarmed with deserters; and when the prince's forces were counted at Carlisle, a full thousand were missing.²

The prince asked the people of Great Britain whether the fifty-seven years during which his family had been in exile had been a time of great prosperity. There are few persons able to survey the course of events during nearly sixty years; still fewer on whom some present grievance does not make far more impression than the steady march of improvement during which individual interests may often suffer. In England, excepting in Yorkshire, where the archbishop headed a loyal demonstration, there was little enthusiasm on behalf of the government; but even the Jacobites wished to remain, for the most part, spectators during the movement. At the time of the last insurrection, in 1715, nearly all Lancashire had been favourable to the Stuarts, but the lapse of thirty years had done much to strengthen social order and to abate the enthusiasm once felt for the old family. Manchester, however, which was considered more inclined to the prince than any other town in England, illuminated on his arrival, contributed about £3,000 to his funds, and added, chiefly from the lower classes, recruits to his army. Although the times were less favourable to the cause, the loyalty of willing adherents was not, as previously, abated by the coldness or want of spirit of their leader. The conduct of Charles Edward naturally endeared him to his followers when he persisted in walking at the head of a clan, in order that Lord Pitsligo, the most aged and infirm of his Scottish friends, might use his carriage.

Meantime the forces of the government were advancing

¹ Chambers, p. 138.

² Chambers, p. 154.

against the invaders, under Marshal Wade; the Duke of Cumberland had fixed himself at Lichfield, and a third army was being formed for the protection of London.

The prince was much elated, when, on December 4, he reached Derby, to find himself within a hundred and thirty miles of the capital, and began to discuss the manner in which he should make his expected entry into London, whether on foot or on horseback, whether in English or Highland dress.¹

But the prince's pleasant anticipations now met with stern discouragement. By his own youthful enthusiasm he had, on his first landing in Scotland, overcome the reluctance of his Scottish friends, and had persuaded them to embark on the hazardous step of invading England; but the peril was now becoming too imminent, and loyalty could no longer stifle the remonstrances of prudence. On the morning after the prince entered Derby, Lord George Murray informed him that the officers had unanimously determined to advance no further, and that an immediate retreat was the only safety. They had hitherto been supported by the hope of an English insurrection, or of assistance from France. But these hopes were disappointed. They asked whether the prince could show a single letter of encouragement lately sent by any distinguished Englishman. The number of combatants in the prince's army scarcely amounted to 5,000, and the forces of government, when united, would probably reach 30,000. There appeared, therefore, but one way of escaping impending defeat and slaughter, to retreat to Scotland whilst retreat was still possible. It was with much impatience that Charles listened to arguments which destroyed his most confident hopes.

He pleaded against them in council, he expostulated in private; but all without avail. Unable to command, when opposed by all the other leaders, he yielded with great reluctance, and on December 6 the army began its retreat, which was conducted with so much secrecy and skill that two days' march had been gained before the Duke of Cumberland had heard of the movement. The state of the roads, partly from inclement weather, and partly through the efforts of the retreating army, obstructed the pursuit of the English cavalry. The common soldiers and lower officers were greatly disappointed at a course which rendered all their former efforts fruitless, and no longer kept that strict order which had characterised their advance; but when a skirmish at length took place in West-

¹ Stanhope, iii. 272.

moreland between the English vanguard and the rear of the Scottish army, the English were completely repulsed. Retreating, but still unconquered, the Scots, on December 20, forded the river Esk, and re-entered their own country. Floods rendered the passage difficult, but nearly all the men had safely crossed, when Charles, after passing on horseback, saw one or two of his men carried away by the stream, upon which with great promptitude he sprang forward to rescue them, caught one of the soldiers by the hair, and shouted in Gaelic for help. This intrepidity on behalf of his followers was certain to confirm their personal attachment. But when they arrived at Dumfries, finding that the town had just been illuminated as a token of satisfaction at his reported defeat, Charles imposed a fine of £2,000, and, failing to receive that sum, carried off the provost and another magistrate as securities for its payment.

Glasgow, which had lately sprung into commercial importance, had raised a regiment of 1,200 men to support the government, and was punished by severe exactions, which still further increased its disaffection to the Stuart cause. The prince, however, received new accessions on his return to Scotland, which increased his army to nearly 9,000 men, the largest force which he ever mustered.

On January 17, General Hawley, commander of the English troops in Scotland, was surprised and defeated at Falkirk by the Highlanders, aided by a fierce wind and driving rain which beat in the faces of the English. This victory, although greatly mortifying to the English commander, did not add to the power of the Stuarts. The common Highlanders, always bent upon plunder, eagerly stripped the slain, and, flying to the mountains with their booty, deserted the Scottish army for a time, whilst the English were incited to take a prompt and decisive revenge.

The Duke of Cumberland, the king's second son, who had already taken a leading part in the Continental war, was appointed to the chief command in Scotland, with Hawley as his second. The duke arrived at Edinburgh on January 30, occupying the same bed at Holyrood House on which Prince Charles had so lately reposed. The prince, who was at that time besieging the strong castle of Stirling, had again the mortification of receiving a memorial signed by his principal supporters, who lamented that under present circumstances they could see no way of extricating their army from impending destruction except by an immediate retreat to the High-

lands, where in the following spring a sufficient force might again be collected for a fresh expedition.

Greatly disappointed, but unable to overcome the determination of his friends, Charles sullenly yielded, and soon found his forces cooped up among barren mountains and cut off from supplies, while several French ships bringing gold and soldiers to his aid were captured by British cruisers or driven on the Scottish shore to be despoiled by the enemy. The prince's army suffered from hunger, and was thinned by desertion, whilst the Duke of Cumberland, as he advanced along the coast, received supplies from the English fleet.¹ A decisive battle was fought at length on Culloden Moor, on April 16.

Before the engagement, the duke addressed his soldiers, enjoining that if, from connexion with the rebels or from any other cause, any of his followers wished to withdraw, he begged them to do so, as he would rather face the Highlanders with a smaller number of brave men. Loud cheers followed this address. Charles fixed his position on a little eminence behind the second line. The two princes in command of the opposing armies were nearly of the same age, both eminently brave, both experienced in war. In the formation of the Stuart line, the Macdonalds, commanded by Lord John Drummond, were placed on the left. Ever since the battle of Bannockburn, they had held themselves entitled to take position on the right, and the disregard of this, their accustomed privilege, abated the men's ardour, even when appealed to by the chief. The forces on the right and in the centre charged with their usual courage, but were soon thrown into disorder by the English fire. The feelings of both parties were excited in a high degree. The Highlanders were making one more effort for the prince whom they loved, the English were anxious to wipe out recent dishonour. The battle, which lasted forty minutes, ended in a complete victory for the English. It is said that Charles gazed from his position on the rout of his army and the ruin of his cause with astonishment, with passionate tears, succeeded by despair. Flying from the field on horseback, accompanied by a few friends, he arrived before daybreak on the 17th at the castle of Invergarry, so much exhausted as to throw himself upon the floor for immediate rest. It is reported that about 1,000 Highlanders were slain, but not more than 300 of the English

¹ Mr. Chambers saw and tested a piece of the bread with which the Stuart army was furnished, which had been preserved for eighty-one years in a Jacobite family as an interesting relic. It appeared made of the husks of oats and the coarse dust found on the floor of a mill.—Chambers's History, p. 258.

army.¹ The defeated army separated, part, among which were the French auxiliaries, escaping to Inverness and yielding their arms to the duke; whilst the rest, more orderly but thinned by continual desertions, numbered about 1,200 men on their arrival at Ruthven, and these Lord George Murray still hoped to keep together for better times. But the prince's ardour was quenched by this last defeat, and he wrote to thank his friends for their zeal on his behalf, but also to urge them to take measures for their own safety. The rebellion which thus ended was followed by sad suffering and many acts of cruelty. The Duke of Cumberland fixed his head-quarters at Fort Augustus, the centre of the insurgent districts, and vigorous measures were put in force against the unfortunate people who had been induced to rise against an unseen government by leaders to whom they had been accustomed to render the obedience of children.

Those who disturb the tranquillity of a State must expect severity, but the duke's severity was branded even by his contemporaries as butchery.² The rebel districts were laid waste, and the cabins were destroyed. The men, who fled to the mountains, were frequently shot, and the helpless women and children either perished or begged their bread. The narrative of the prince's escape, and of his wanderings from April to September, sounds more like a tale of romance than of real life. Sometimes alone, sometimes accompanied by a single Highlander, Charles made his way from mountain to island, distressed by many calamities, but defended by the disinterested loyalty of the brave men who, notwithstanding their poverty, although accustomed to a lawless life, scorned to break their faith towards the fugitive descendant of their kings, even when the reward of £30,000 was offered for his capture. Eight days after the battle of Culloden, Charles was for the second time the guest of that Clanranald, who, on his first landing, had tried to dissuade him from his enterprise. Clanranald again relieved his wants, but warned him of the danger of staying in an island where a large party of soldiers were seeking him out. At this moment of extreme peril, a young lady named Flora Macdonald came forward to the prince's rescue. She, then a visitor at the house of Clanranald, was a stepdaughter of a captain engaged in searching for the prince, and obtained a passport for herself, a Highland

¹ Chambers, p. 263.

² In fact, he passed in the common talk of the world under the nickname of 'the Butcher.'

servant, and a female attendant. Having disguised the prince in woman's apparel, she embarked with him in an open boat, and they were so fortunate as to land in safety in the Isle of Skye. That island belonged to Sir Alexander Macdonald, an adherent of the government, who was then absent. Flora implored the protection of his wife, Lady Margaret, and was allowed again to furnish the prince with the means of escaping to the Isle of Rasay, after which Charles again retired to mountain recesses, and was for some days concealed in a cave inhabited by seven Highlanders, who had to live a bandit life, and who took a solemn oath not to divulge the prince's secret to any human being. Whilst still among the mountains, the welcome news reached the prince that two French vessels had been sent for his use and were anchored at the same spot at which he had landed fourteen months before. Travelling by night to avoid detection, Charles reached that place in safety, and, on September 20, embarked, accompanied, it is said, by about one hundred and thirty Scottish gentlemen, who had collected on the coast in the hope of escape. Many wept when they lost sight of the Scottish coast, although striving to keep up the hope of a speedy and triumphant return. After a voyage of nine days they reached France in safety. Flora Macdonald, having been discovered to have assisted the prince's escape, was arrested and brought to London. But the interest excited by her noble daring was too great to allow of the infliction of any severe punishment. For some months she was detained in a kind of honourable captivity; but after an Act of Indemnity, passed in July, 1747, she returned to Scotland in a post-chaise provided by a Jacobite lady of quality in London, accompanied by Malcolm Macleod, who had been the prince's companion during some of his hairbreadth escapes in the isles.¹ Some sympathising English ladies subscribed a considerable sum for Flora. She married a Macdonald, and lived for some time in America, but returned at length to Scotland with her husband, and died in the Isle of Skye. The number of lives forfeited by executions after the rebellion is said to have been nearly eighty, but only one Highland chief is reported to have perished on the scaffold.²

The severest penalty of the law was, however, imposed upon the Earl of Kilmarnock, on Lords Balmerino and Lovat, and on Charles Radcliffe, brother of the Earl of Derwentwater who had been beheaded in 1716. Lord Lovat was then not far from

¹ Chambers, p. 315.

² *Ib.* pp. 303-305.

eighty years of age. The same fate was mercilessly inflicted on numerous persons of less distinction, the Duke of Cumberland still advocating severity. Parliament recorded its thanks to the duke for the bravery and skill with which he had crushed a formidable rebellion, and he received a pension of £25,000. The memory of Charles Edward was long cherished in the Highlands, and has been perpetuated in prose and in verse. But all his romantic enthusiasm, and, with that, all the apparent generosity of his character, soon passed away. Satisfaction in his own fortunate escape soon superseded the natural dejection with which he contemplated the fate of the brave men whom he had tempted into insurrection. His brother Henry wrote, soon after his escape to France, that Charles was no way altered, except by having become stouter, and had as much liking for the chase as ever. When for the first time he appeared at the opera in Paris he was hailed with applause, but he could obtain no promise of future aid from the governments of France or Spain. It was also in vain that he solicited the aid of Frederick of Prussia, even offering to marry a Protestant princess.¹ Conditions of peace between France, Spain, and England analogous to those adopted in 1718 were signed at Aix-la-Chapelle in 1748, by which the Protestant succession in England and the exclusion from France of the Stuart family were confirmed as before. The French court was not entirely unmindful of Charles Stuart, and proposed to obtain for him a residence at Fribourg, in Switzerland, where he might still retain the title of Prince of Wales, enjoying a suitable income and retinue; but, unmindful of his father's advice, he positively refused to quit Paris. As a last resource, Louis XV. determined on arresting him, but allowed his intention publicly to transpire, that the prince might beat a timely retreat. Charles Edward, however, disregarded all warnings, and was at length arrested by French guards on the night of December 11, when on his way to the opera, and conveyed to the state prison at Vincennes. The French government only wished to remove a troublesome visitor, and after spending a few days in prison he was sent to Avignon and set at liberty. For some years after this the prince led a wandering life without communication with his former friends; but, in 1750, he is said to have ventured to England in company with a Colonel Brett, and to have met about fifty English partisans. His stay during a fortnight in a London lodging was either unknown to the government or

¹ In 1747 Henry Stuart became Cardinal York, a step which Charles Edward felt to be so adverse to his interests that he ceased to correspond with him.

disregarded. He declared, however, that with the support of only 4,000 armed followers he would attempt another enterprise; receiving no encouragement, he returned to Italy, where he sank into intemperate habits. His father died at Rome in 1766, and the death of Charles Edward at the same place, from paralysis, in 1788, caused little sensation in Europe. There were still, however, in Scotland a few persons who ventured to wear mourning for a prince whom they had once loved so well.¹ After the suppression of the rebellion measures were taken to disarm the Highlanders, and even to abolish the use of their favourite garb, the tartan. Any person wearing any part of the Highland costume, the dress of various colours, after August 1, 1747, was liable to be imprisoned for six months, and to be transported on a repetition of the offence.²

The European war in which England had taken part was terminated in 1748, and Maria Theresa was left in possession of all her dominions excepting Silesia, which was retained by the King of Prussia.

Although there was no longer a Stuart claimant for the British crown, the English people looked forward with dissatisfaction to the close of the reign, distrusting the feeble character of Frederick, Prince of Wales, and dreading the stern violence of his brother, the Duke of Cumberland. But in March, 1751, the Prince of Wales was carried off by a sudden illness, and his son Prince George, who was only twelve years of age, became the heir-apparent. Prince Frederick, who had maintained a constant opposition to his father, appears to have been little regretted even by his own petty court. The princess immediately expressed her desire to be guided entirely by the king, and it was decided by the Bill of Regency that if the present sovereign should die before his grandson George, who was now created Prince of Wales, attained the age of eighteen, his mother should be his guardian and the regent of the kingdom. She was to be assisted by a council, including the Duke of Cumberland and the nine principal officers of state serving at the time of the king's death. Unfortunately this princess, who naturally exercised much influence over her son, had been brought up in the narrowest ideas prevailing at petty German courts, and infused into his mind a strong repugnance to those constitu-

¹ Stanhope, iii. 350, iv. 8; Hallam's 'Constitutional History,' ii. 416-418, notes.

² Chambers, p. 410. In the year 1753, another life, happily the last, was forfeited for attachment to the Stuarts. Dr. Archibald Cameron, brother of 'Lochiel,' came from the Continent in disguise to recover money left by the prince in Scotland. The government suspected a plot, and he was executed as a traitor.—Stanhope, iv. 29.

tional principles of government which in England curb the exercise of the royal prerogative. The young prince was educated in great seclusion, acquiring little knowledge of books or men, but nurtured in decided aversion to Whig ministers.

An Act of Parliament passed in 1751, which, framed under the advice of learned men and injurious to nobody, nevertheless attracted much ignorant clamour. The mode of computing the days of the year had been found defective, and in all European countries excepting England, Russia, and Sweden, a 'New Style' had been adopted, according to which eleven days were suppressed from the month of September in one year only. The year, which till now had begun on March 25, according to the new plan commenced on January 1. Although care was taken to guard against confusion in regard to leases and the payment of rent, the common people declared themselves cheated of a portion of the year, and when, in 1754, the son of the second Lord Macclesfield, a mathematician who had promoted the measure, was a candidate for election in Oxfordshire, the most vehement cry against him was, 'Give us back the eleven days of which we have been robbed!'¹

By the treaty of Utrecht in 1713, the province of Nova Scotia, called by the French Acadia, came into the possession of the English. It was in great part a sterile wilderness, and, as its boundaries had not been exactly defined, frequent disputes occurred between the French Canadians and the English settlers. The French, who had been the first Europeans in Canada, also possessed the southern province of Louisiana, and by their conciliatory conduct towards the native tribes exercised considerable influence beyond the limits of their colonies. Frequent skirmishes took place between the neighbouring emigrants of the rival nations, which led to very serious consequences.

The name of Major George Washington first appears on record at this time, he having been sent at the head of a small force to repel the combined French and Indians on the banks of the Ohio, when, being surrounded by superior numbers, he was obliged to agree to honourable terms of capitulation. The blow thus struck on the Ohio commenced the series of events which ended, thirty years afterwards, in establishing the inde-

¹ Stanhope, iv. 15; Campbell's 'Lives of the Chancellors.' The candidate was grandson of Chancellor Macclesfield. The eleven days were dropped which came between September 2 and 14, so that for this year, 1752, there were only nineteen days in that month.—'Penny Cyclopædia,' article 'Kalendar.'

pendence of the colonies planted by the English in North America.¹

A still severer repulse was suffered a year later by the English General Braddock, who had been despatched to the relief of Virginia and perished on the field. During the winter of 1756 there was continual apprehension in England of a French invasion, and addresses were carried to the king from both Houses of Parliament recommending that troops from Hanover and Hesse should be summoned to assist in defending the shores of England.² The aid of England had just previously been given to Portugal, which was suffering from one of the most awful of natural catastrophes. On November 1, 1755, which, being All Saints' Day, was celebrated with great solemnity at Lisbon, an earthquake, which shook every building to its centre, destroyed about a fourth of the city, and occasioned the death of some thousands of the people.³ The English Parliament voted a gift of £100,000 for the relief of the sufferers, an act of beneficence which was long remembered in Portugal.

The government about this time became aware that preparations were making in France for regaining the island of Minorca, the possession of which had been guaranteed to England at the peace of Utrecht. An English fleet was sent out for the defence of that island, commanded by Admiral Byng, second son of Lord Torrington, and on May 20, 1756, the English and French fleets approached each other. Admiral West, the second in command, assailed the French with impetuosity, but was not supported by Byng, who, either from timidity or prudence, determined to leave Minorca to its fate, and to return to protect Gibraltar. The English garrison of St. Philip's, disappointed at losing the expected succour, after continuing for some weeks to defend the castle, at last capitulated to the Duke de Richelieu, who granted them the honours of war.

When the news of Byng's retreat and the consequent loss of Minorca reached England, the excitement was greater than had been known since the South Sea panic, and a loud cry arose for the punishment of the unfortunate admiral. When Byng landed in England in December, he was sent to prison, and underwent a long trial, ending in a resolution which, acquitting him of treachery or cowardice, declared that he had

¹ See Sparks's 'Life of Washington,' p. 24. Thackeray has described this, the first military action of George Washington, in the novel of 'The Virginians.'

² Stanhope iv.62.

³ *Ib.*, p. 61. 'The richest sovereign in Europe was reduced in a single day to be the poorest.'

not taken the right course in relieving the garrison or in defeating the French fleet. Considering all the circumstances, the court had no alternative but to sentence him to death, yet unanimously recommended him to the royal clemency. Such a recommendation, when sent by the judges, is seldom without effect, and the members of the court repeated their statement when separately examined by the highest in the law, Lords Hardwicke and Mansfield. Still, however, the general popular opinion was in favour of his execution; and, although Pitt declared in the House of Commons his wish that the sentence should be mitigated, and endeavoured to intercede with the king, the sovereign decided upon the execution of the sentence. On March 14, the unfortunate admiral was shot by soldiers on board the 'Monarque' in Portsmouth Harbour. He died with calmness and unflinching courage.¹ It was not till May 18 of the preceding year, just prior to the French descent upon Minorca, that England declared war against France, while at the same time began the great continental struggle of 'the Seven Years' War.'

During ten years the great Frederick had been at peace, busily employed in recruiting the resources which had been materially exhausted by his long struggle for the possession of Silesia. That time of peace had tended also to restore the strength of Austria, but had not obliterated the memory of the wrongs inflicted by Frederick. It now became known to the King of Prussia that a secret agreement for the conquest and partition of his dominions had been formed by Austria, Russia, and Saxony. He sprang eagerly to arms, and promptly marched an army into Saxony. He looked out for an ally, and although there had been hitherto no cordiality between him and his uncle, George II., he formed an alliance with England, while France, his former ally, joined Austria against him.

In the next year, 1757, George II. found himself compelled to recall to power that minister for whom he had so long felt personal dislike, William Pitt, afterwards frequently called 'the Great Commoner.' The height of his popularity had been attained long before he received the title of Earl of Chatham, by which he has since been distinguished from his

¹ 'Les Anglais fusillaient un amiral pour encourager les autres,' were the words of Voltaire. He exerted himself in obtaining from Marshal Richelieu a declaration of his favourable opinion of the unfortunate admiral's bravery and judgment, and this statement is said to have changed the opinion of some of the members of the court-martial, although it did not avail to save him. Byng charged his executors to express his gratitude to both Voltaire and Richelieu.—See Morley's 'Life of Voltaire.' Stanhope, iv. 96.

illustrious son. 'The first administration of Chatham,' as it has been frequently although incorrectly termed, was formed in June, 1757.¹

The voice of the country had been most decidedly raised in that minister's favour, and gold boxes containing the freedom of the chief towns of England were showered upon him. Although Pitt had been opposed some years previously to England's continental alliances, he now strenuously supported the connexion with Frederick, and alarmed France by frequent descents upon her shores. By good judgment in the appointment of commanders, and care in all means of preparation, England was in the course of three years considerably advanced in influence and power. Pitt even gained the complete confidence of the king. During the year 1758, England opposed France in every quarter of the globe; in India, in the settlements on the coast of Africa, and most effectually in North America. Canada at this time did not contain more than 60,000 inhabitants, but, although less wealthy than the British province called New England, was known to possess advantages which would repay a great effort for its acquisition.

The enterprise for the conquest of Canada, which was one of Pitt's first objects, was entrusted to General Wolfe, a veteran who had gained his experience under Marlborough.

British forces had already been successful in the western direction, and had taken the fortress of Niagara, when, on June 27, Wolfe landed his army in front of the apparently impregnable city of Quebec, which is built on a ridge of rocks at the spot where the river St. Charles joins the St. Lawrence. The brave French governor, the Marquis de Montcalm, had been lately reinforced, and relying on the strength of his position, resisted all efforts to tempt him to an engagement. The difficulties of an attack had nearly brought Wolfe to despair, when he resolved to cross the St. Lawrence in the night and to lead his troops up 'the Heights of Abraham,' by a narrow precipitous path, on parts of which only one person could proceed. Having succeeded in crossing the river at about one o'clock in the morning of September 13, the English, proceeding sometimes in single file, scaled the precipice, each man supporting himself as he best could by branches of trees or points of rock. The French picket, aroused by the noise of their ascent,

¹ Called by Lord Stanhope 'the greatest and most glorious administration, perhaps, that England had ever yet known.'—iv. 108. Pitt was premier and secretary of state, the Duke of Newcastle, to whom he had been formerly opposed, being first lord of the Treasury. Mr. Pitt did not become Earl of Chatham till 1766.

fired at random and fled, struck with surprise at the sudden appearance of foes whom they had believed to be on the other side of the river. When the marquis was informed of the movement he at first considered it incredible. A bloody battle ensued, in which the English gained the victory, but both generals received mortal wounds.

Wolfe said that he died happy in knowing that the French had been compelled to retreat, and Montcalm, who, when endeavouring to rally his soldiers, had been struck by a cannon-ball, was consoled by the thought that he should not survive the surrender of the city.

Quebec capitulated on September 18, the garrison being allowed all the honours of war, and to return to France. The exultation which the victory would have excited in England was chastened by sorrow for the death of the brave general. On receipt of the news many persons put on mourning, and Parliament unanimously resolved that a monument should be erected to his memory in Westminster Abbey. A lofty obelisk, which stands in the government gardens at Quebec, bears on the one side the name of Wolfe, on the other of Montcalm, a memorial of the bravery of both commanders. The conquest of Canada was completed when, in May, 1760, another British squadron, commanded by General Amherst, landed in the isle of Montreal, and, after the capitulation of the French governor of that town, the whole province became a British possession. Louisiana alone, at the mouth of the Mississippi, still remained a French colony.

The extraordinary success of the English in India has been less understood and less frequently related than the progress of the European conquests, in America. It was from Queen Elizabeth, in 1600, that the English merchants forming the East India Company obtained their first charter. Forty years afterwards, they procured from a Hindoo prince permission to purchase the land on which they built Fort St. George and the city of Madras, which soon became a thriving town. Bombay was made over by the Portuguese government to Charles II., as part of the Infanta's dowry, but it yielded no profit before the king transferred it to the company. It was not till 1698 that the English company obtained the land in Bengal on which Fort William was first erected, and subsequently that 'city of palaces,' the great town of Calcutta. These three stations were called presidencies, because each was separately governed by a president and council, appointed by the directors of the company, who resided in England. It was as merchants

only that the English were, during this, their first century, known in India. The safety of their establishments was often threatened by the fierce incursions of the Mahrattas; also by the jealousy of the French, who had likewise an East India company, and had formed settlements on the river Hooghly and at Pondicherry, to the south of Madras. In fact, the rival Europeans sought aggrandisement by occasionally taking part in the contests of the native princes. The English company having few regular soldiers in its pay, even commercial clerks occasionally felt themselves compelled to take to arms in self-defence. It was in 1750 that one of these clerks, named Robert Clive, who had distinguished himself on many occasions by bravery, became a captain, and showed that he had both the skill and courage of an accomplished officer.¹ Dupleix, the able French governor of Pondicherry, had obtained great ascendancy, when the English company resolved to make an effort to prevent the establishment of French domination throughout the whole peninsula, and sent Clive, at the head of a small force of 200 English soldiers and 300 natives under English discipline, to gain possession of Arcot, the capital of the Carnatic.

On Clive's approach the garrison fled, and the English entered the fort without a blow, but were soon besieged by an Indian prince, called Rajah Sahib, supported by his French allies. During the fifty days of the siege Captain Clive maintained the defence with a firmness and ability which would have done honour to the oldest commander, and was served with affectionate devotion by troops differing in language, colour, and religion. It has been related, as a touching proof of the disinterested fidelity of the Indian sepoys, that when the besieged garrison became pressed by hunger, these Indians proposed that all the grain should be given to the Europeans, saying that the thin gruel strained from the rice was sufficient for the smaller appetite of Asiatics.² A violent assault by Rajah Sahib was the concluding act of the siege, elephants, armed with iron plates, being driven against the gates; but the assault proved a failure, and the enemy withdrew after a considerable loss. This successful defence, which was followed by other successes, greatly raised the fame of Clive, who, on returning to England to recruit his health in 1753, was received with great distinction, and was appointed governor of Fort St. David, before he returned to India in 1755. The great province of Bengal, the most wealthy and fertile part of India, in 1756 fell under the sway of a youth of weak understanding

¹ Stanhope, iv. 305.

² See Macaulay's 'Essay on Clive.'

and cruel disposition, named Surajah Dowlah, who had imbibed a great hatred of the English. He found pretexts for a quarrel, and marched with a large army against Fort William, the fortress protecting Calcutta, of which he took possession with a considerable number of English prisoners. Having ordered Mr. Holwell, who ranked the first among the captives, to be brought before him, the Nabob grumbled at the scanty treasure which he found at Calcutta, but promised to spare the lives of the prisoners. Then followed a night of suffering and sacrifice known as that of 'the Black Hole of Calcutta.' One hundred and forty-six Englishmen were driven by the guards into a dungeon twenty feet square, in which, amidst terrible sufferings from thirst and want of air, all but twenty-three perished before the dawn of day. When this foul act of cruelty became known in the settlement, there was a general outcry for vengeance, and an eager demand that Clive should be placed at the head of the troops, and Colonel Lawrence, who was declining in health, warmly supported the proposal. Clive was supported by Admiral Watson.¹ On January 2, the English regained possession of Calcutta. Clive entered eagerly into a conspiracy formed in Moorshedabad to depose the Prince Surajah Dowlah, and to place the general of the Indian forces, Meer Jaffier, on the throne of Bengal. The odious vices of Surajah had disgusted all classes of his subjects, and the wrongs which he had already inflicted on the English justified the determination to dethrone him. The power of the Nabob was still very great, and when, in June, 1757, he prepared to encounter the English at Plassey with an army twenty times as numerous, anxious fears filled the minds of both the hostile commanders. Forty thousand foot-soldiers, variously armed with fire-arms, pikes, and bows and arrows, covered the plain, accompanied by fifty of the largest kind of ordnance and 15,000 cavalry drawn from the bolder race which inhabits the northern provinces of India. To this vast multitude Clive could only oppose 3,000 men, of whom nearly a third were Englishmen, but the whole of whom were under English direction. Clive called a council of war, a majority of which advised him not to engage under such a fearful disparity, and his own first opinion concurred with theirs; but after an hour's reflection he resolved to try the chances, and prepared for battle on the following morning. The cannonade with which the English began the contest spread disorder through the Indian ranks. Several of Surajah Dowlah's first officers

¹ Stanhope, iv. 321.

fell, and one, who had conspired against him, advised him to retreat. He ordered his army to fall back, and by that order determined the fate of the battle. Clive immediately ordered his troops to advance, and the rout of the Indian army became complete. Only 500 of that host were slain, but their camp, guns, waggon, and cattle, all remained with the conquerors. With the loss of about twenty-two soldiers killed and fifty wounded, Clive scattered an army of nearly 60,000 men.¹ The men of the 39th regiment, who bore a conspicuous place in that small English army, still carry on their colours, amidst many other honourable records, the name of Plassey, and the proud motto 'Primus in Indis.' Flying from the fatal field, Surajah Dowlah reached Moorshedabad on his camel in little more than twenty-four hours, and asked the advice of his counsellors. They suggested a renewal of war, but his own fears urged him to flight, and, disguised in mean attire, but carrying a casket of jewels, he secretly escaped from the palace, and embarked on the river. In a few days Colonel Clive arrived at the Nabob's deserted capital, where he immediately installed Meer Jaffier as Nabob of Bengal, congratulating the natives, through an interpreter, on the good fortune which had freed them from a detested tyrant.² Surajah Dowlah was soon taken prisoner, and brought before Meer Jaffier, whose pity he implored with abject cowardice, but met with a speedy sentence of death.

Wealth was showered upon the East India Company and its servants. The sum of £800,000, in coined silver, was sent to Calcutta by a hundred boats, with flags flying and music playing. Clive accepted for his own share a gift exceeding £200,000, and became from this time, during several years, the real master of Bengal. When, some years afterwards, he was accused in the House of Commons of having obtained too much wealth in India, he exclaimed that he might with ease have enriched himself much more. 'When I recollect,' said he, 'entering the Nabob's treasury at Moorshedabad, amidst heaps of gold and silver crowned with jewels, I am astonished at my own moderation.'³ In February, 1760, Colonel Clive, having for some time suffered in health, embarked for Eng-

¹ See Macaulay's 'Essay on Lord Clive,' vol. ii. of Essays, p. 489, small edition.

² For the account of the treachery with which Clive treated Omichund, the Bengalee merchant, see Macaulay's Essay.

³ Stanhope, iv. 335, quoted from Malcolm's 'Life of Clive.' The English Parliament looked with creditable suspicion on the temptations thus offered, and by an Act passed at a later period prohibited the practice of taking presents from Asiatic sovereigns.

land, where he was most favourably received, and raised by George III. to an Irish peerage under the title of Lord Clive of Plassey. Clive did not obtain by this title a seat in the House of Lords, and he employed much of the wealth which he had acquired in India in gaining parliamentary influence in the House of Commons.

The measures of Mr. Pitt had been crowned with general success both at home and abroad. The Electorate of Hanover, to which the King of England had been so much attached, had been in great peril during the French invasion, but was saved by a confederate army of English and German troops commanded by Prince Frederick of Brunswick, who, in 1759, gained a great victory over the French at Minden, for which he was rewarded by King George with a gift of £20,000, a pension, and the Order of the Garter. Macaulay describes the position held by Mr. Pitt at the close of this reign as 'the most enviable ever occupied by any public man in English history. He had conciliated the king; he dominated over the House of Commons; he was adored by the people; he was admired by all Europe. He was the first Englishman of his time, and he had made England the first country in the world.'

On October 25, 1760, George II. suddenly expired, at the age of seventy-seven, and was immediately succeeded by his grandson, the Prince of Wales.

Although George II. took no interest personally either in literature or art, he was a steady patron of Handel, and constantly attended the performance of his musical compositions, while the court and nobility preferred the fashionable Italian music of the day, and stigmatised Handel as a German intruder. The 'Messiah' was for some time during this reign performed annually, under Handel's own direction, for the benefit of the Foundling Hospital. The great composer, who had been blind for eight years, died in 1759, one year before his royal patron.

In the same year the Eddystone lighthouse was completed, the great work of Smeaton, which still continues to guard the entrance to Plymouth Sound, exposed to the full fury of the Atlantic Ocean. Two buildings had been previously erected there: the first was destroyed by a storm in 1703; the second by fire in 1755. The last was built of stone. A general view of this reign would be incomplete without some notice of the great efforts made to spread the Christian faith among the poor by the celebrated John Wesley and his coadjutors, the founders of the Methodist community. John Wesley, born in the year 1703, at his father's parsonage at Epworth, in Lincolnshire, was

regularly educated and ordained to be a clergyman of the English Church, and was a Fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford. At the University he met George Whitfield, with whom, and his own brother Charles, he formed a little band of zealous enthusiasts who visited the prisoners in the gaol, and longed to spread religion among those classes for whom the Church had hitherto effected so little. Their ardent aspirations could not be satisfied by the calm routine of a country clergyman's life, and Wesley declined the offer of his father's pulpit. 'The great struggle between good and evil,' says Dr. Southey, 'had not yet commenced.' The poor were at that time totally uneducated, and in many places, where population had greatly increased, the masses were utterly neglected, only restrained from the most heinous crimes by the severe punishments of the criminal code. After a short time passed in the American province of Georgia, where their preaching attracted much attention, the Wesleys and Whitfield returned to London, but the fervour of their appeals, and the occasional irregularity of services prolonged to a late hour, displeased the heads of the Church, and several of the London churches were closed against Wesley. It was Whitfield who first introduced field-preaching, and found among the rough ignorant colliers of Kingsdown, near Bristol, a congregation sometimes amounting to twenty thousand, who listened to him with eager interest, wept, sang together, and promised to abandon their sins. Wesley soon joined Whitfield at Bristol. By the weekly penny subscribed by a vast number a sum was raised towards the erection of the first meeting-house, in which ornament had no place.¹

Wesley formed classes, appointed class-leaders, gradually organised the vast Methodist community, and carried the first religious appeals to the Cornish miners, and the lonely moors of Northumberland. The first stone of the Bristol meeting-house was laid in 1739, and soon afterwards meeting-houses were built in different parts of England. In his great need of aid Wesley was induced to employ some men who left common employments to become preachers, and who were both ignorant and imprudent; this, besides other irregularities, brought him into disfavour with the Church, and made him unwillingly a Dissenter. It is difficult fairly to estimate the effect for good and ill of exhortations which sometimes produced among the hearers temporary madness, and the inculcation of such severity as tended to deprive life of its charm. But, although apparent conversions were not always maintained, many sinners

¹ Wesley was himself a great contributor to the expense of the building.

were doubtless rescued from brutality by these fervent and eloquent appeals. Both Wesley and Whitfield traversed England on horseback, the latter extending his travels to Scotland and Ireland; and, forty years after the community was formed at Bristol, the Methodists in England amounted to 70,300, a number which was doubled in the course of the next twenty years; the conversions in America, to which Whitfield paid frequent visits, were even greater in proportion to the population.¹ Unlike the Puritans of the seventeenth century, whom in some respects they resembled, the Methodists were not ardent politicians, but generally well-affected towards the government.

The name of 'Methodists' was first applied to Wesley and his friends at Oxford, because they lived by rule and method; thus, as in the case of Quakers, a casual and somewhat derisive epithet became retained for convenience. Although their success was great, the violent treatment with which they were assailed often put their lives in danger. John Wesley computed the extent of his journeys on horseback to have annually exceeded 4,000 miles. He died in March, 1791, at the advanced age of eighty-eight. His brother Charles, some of whose hymns form a valuable part of most collections of sacred poetry, never forsook communion with the Church of England, and when he died, in his eightieth year, was buried in the churchyard of Marylebone.

Whitfield died in New England in the year 1770. The spread of education has softened the peculiarities of the Methodists, and their preachers have been of late neither distinguished by the eloquence nor by the extravagance of their founders.

¹ Southey's 'Life of Wesley,' ii. 229.

CHAPTER XXXVI.

GEORGE III.

A.D. 1760—1810.

ON October 28, 1760, at the age of twenty-two, George, Prince of Wales, succeeded to the throne of his grandfather. The Marquis of Bute, who became for a time Pitt's political rival, was little known to the world at large, but had been a lord of the bedchamber to Frederick, Prince of Wales, who valued his talents for the direction of the theatrical amusements of his petty court at Leicester House. Appreciating his grace of deportment far more highly than the qualities of his mind, the prince is said to have told Bute that he was well adapted 'to be envoy at some small, proud German court where there was nothing to do.'¹ After his death in 1751, the princess reposed her chief confidence in the marquis, and it was immediately apparent that he was held in much esteem by the young king.

On the day of the king's accession, when Mr. Pitt brought up to the palace a sketch of the speech which he intended to read to the privy council, he found with surprise that Lord Bute had already submitted an address, some expressions in which implied censure of the administration conducted by him; and corrections on which Pitt insisted were but reluctantly acceded to. On the day when this point was debated Bute was introduced into the Cabinet, and he was soon afterwards made one of the secretaries of state.

Popular jealousy of the ascendancy of a favourite and a Scotsman was immediately shown by a handbill affixed to the Royal Exchange, running, 'No petticoat government; no Scotch favourite!'

The king's first speech to Parliament, however, gained popular favour. 'Born and educated in this country,' said the

¹ Macaulay's second essay 'On Earl of Chatham.'

king, 'I glory in the name of Briton, and the peculiar happiness of my life will ever consist in promoting the welfare of a people whose loyalty and attachment to me I consider the greatest and most permanent security of my throne.' This, indeed, favourably distinguished the new sovereign from his immediate predecessors, that English was his native language. The two first kings of the House of Hanover had been, in feeling as well as speech, far more German than English, and were only respected by their Whig subjects as the chief magistrates of a constitutional monarchy, whilst the Tories continued to look to the Stuart prince as the rightful heir. Although Pitt's administration had succeeded in dissolving the Jacobite party, many great families had still held aloof from the court of George II. But the accession of a young king wholly untainted with Hanoverian partialities, happily brought many of these former recusants to the levée, where they met with a kind and cordial reception. 'Probably,' says Hallam, 'scarcely one person of the rank of a gentleman south of the Tweed was found to dispute the right of the House of Brunswick after 1760.'¹ The king's popularity was likewise increased by a proposal made to Parliament at the close of the session, which was attributed to his personal suggestion. Under the Stuarts the judges held their offices so long as they pleased the sovereign, and were in many cases instruments of royal tyranny. Although the Act of Settlement had secured their independence, their offices had been allowed to expire soon after the king's death, so that it was part of the new sovereign's duty to grant them fresh commissions. It was now recommended in the royal speech that the judges should remain in office undisturbed by a change of sovereignty, 'a noble improvement,' observes Blackstone, to which Parliament unanimously agreed.²

In July, 1761, the king announced to the privy council his intention to marry the Princess Charlotte of Mecklenburg-Strelitz, of an ancient German House, and of strict Protestant principles. This young princess, then scarcely seventeen, had, some months earlier, ventured to address a letter to the King of Prussia, at the time when his troops invaded the neighbouring duchy of Mecklenburg-Schwerin, beseeching his clemency towards the poor inhabitants. Frederick, whether influenced or not by the petition, sent this epistle to his uncle, George II., and it is said to have produced a favourable impression at the

¹ Stanhope, iv. 214, and Hallam's 'Constitutional History,' ii. 418, note.

² Stanhope, iv. 217. Hallam considers that an undeserved degree of praise was given to the king in this matter (ii. 357).

English court.¹ The usual forms were now observed, Earl Harcourt was sent to Strelitz to demand the princess in marriage, and three ladies of high rank went over to attend the future Queen of England. After a long and stormy passage, during which the royal yacht was sometimes in danger of being driven on the coast of Norway, while the princess endeavoured to beguile the time by practising English tunes on her harpsichord, she at length landed at Harwich on September 6, and arrived at St. James's on the 8th. The marriage took place in the Chapel Royal on the same afternoon, and on the next day their Majesties held a crowded drawing-room, and gave a ball.

The king and queen were crowned at Westminster Abbey on September 22, and the popular eagerness to behold the pageant was altogether unexampled.

The characters of Mr. Pitt and Lord Bute differed too widely for them to work harmoniously in the same Cabinet. There were also prudent men in office who thought Pitt too fond of war, and far too reckless of the heavy charges which the country would incur. War had made him powerful and popular, and many thought that he had 'begun to love war for its own sake, and was more disposed to quarrel with neutrals than to make peace with enemies.'²

The campaign of 1761, although adverse to Prussia, was yet unfavourable to France, which was totally unable to bear the continued expenditure. Nevertheless the negotiations for peace, which had already begun on the continent, were still deferred by the great English minister. Indeed, Pitt had received notice of the double-dealing Bourbon schemes to the effect that, at the very time when they were declaring their desire to enter upon friendly relations with England, the Kings of France and Spain had signed a treaty called 'the Family Compact,' by which each agreed to consider in future any power as an enemy which might become the antagonist of the other. By this treaty the two powers bound themselves, although not in express terms, to make war on England in common, and it appeared probable that Spain only postponed the declaration of hostilities till her fleet should have brought home the treasures expected from America.

Forewarned of this intention, Pitt broke off the pending negotiations, intending to intercept the Spanish fleet and to attack the colonies, and advised the council immediately

¹ A version of the princess's letter was published in the 'Annual Register' of 1764, but, according to Lord Stanhope, one not altogether correct.

² Macaulay's second essay 'On the Earl of Chatham,' 'Essays,' iii. 467.

to declare war against Spain. This advice, being opposed by Lord Bute, was rejected by a large majority of the council, upon which Pitt, on October 5, resigned his office and was succeeded by his rival. The king behaved to Pitt with respectful kindness when he surrendered the seals, and offered him any honour which it was in his power to bestow.

A peerage was conferred upon the wife of the great commoner, and a pension of £3,000 a year was settled on Pitt during his own life, that of Lady Chatham, and of their eldest son.¹ The general respect for his talents and services was shown in a marked way on Lord Mayor's Day, when the king and queen, who were among the guests, passed in state through the streets almost unnoticed, but an admiring throng clustered round Pitt's plain chariot; shouts of applause welcomed his entrance into Guildhall, while outcries of 'No Bute!' assailed the unpopular minister.

It was galling to Lord Bute to find Pitt's predictions immediately verified by the determination of the King of Spain to declare war against England. Expeditions which Pitt had already planned for attacking Martinique, Havannah, and Manilla, proved successful; but the American fleet, which Pitt would have intercepted, had already carried its precious cargo safely to Spain before Bute had become convinced of the necessity of war. Agreeably to his determination to bring about a speedy peace and to detach Britain from continental connexions, Lord Bute soon entered on negotiations with France.

'England,' in the words of Macaulay, 'withdrew, at the cost of a deep stain on her faith, from her German connections,'² for Lord Bute 'on various pleas eluded a renewal of the yearly Prussian subsidy to which Frederick had undoubtedly at this time an equitable claim, and of which he never stood in greater need.'³ What wonder that Frederick from this time forward lost all confidence in the stability of British counsels! The dearly-bought experience of the present age has led men to see the impolicy of wasting British blood and treasure in the maintenance of foreign alliances; but such arguments, however valid against contracting new engagements, could not honourably be enforced to break past pledges.⁴ The terms of the

¹ Stanhope, iv. 245. 'In proposing an immediate declaration of war against Spain, Pitt,' says Lord Stanhope, 'did not urge any immature or ill-considered scheme.'—See also Macaulay's opinion of 'his wise and resolute counsel.'

² Second essay 'On Earl of Chatham,' 'Essays,' iii. 477, small edition.

³ Stanhope's 'History of England,' iv. 251.

⁴ Note the words of Stanhope.

peace between England and France, which were finally signed at Paris on February 10, 1763, were honourable and advantageous to England, although, in the estimation of some statesmen, less so than might have been expected after an almost unbroken series of victories by land and sea, in every part of the world. Canada, Cape Breton, part of Louisiana, Florida, the Senegal, and Minorca, were ceded to Great Britain. As the Canadians were nearly all French settlers and Catholics, full religious toleration was allowed them, a privilege which was not granted to Roman Catholic subjects in England and Ireland till many years later.

France and England having withdrawn from the German contest, Frederick and Maria Theresa now brought to a conclusion the bloody and memorable Seven Years' War. Maria Theresa had failed in the undertaking on which she had set her heart, the re-conquest of Silesia. 'The whole continent in arms had proved unable to tear Silesia from the iron grasp of the king.'¹ After an absence of more than six years, Frederick entered Berlin in triumph, but the rejoicings of his subjects could not conceal the traces of war. It was believed that a sixth part of the male population of Prussia had fallen on the field. Women only had been left to gather in the harvest, and some villages were without inhabitants. For the first time in England since the accession of the House of Hanover, the Tory party had obtained the ascendancy, although a few Whigs still continued in office. There were men in the royal household whose favourite toast, a few years before, had been 'the king over the water.' The University of Oxford, so long the seat of Jacobite disaffection, was now reconciled to the existing government. But Lord Bute was the object of personal hatred to a degree nearly unexampled. He 'was detested by many as a Tory, by many as a favourite, and by many as a Scot.'²

It was feared that Parliament would fail to approve the preliminaries of the treaty of peace. Although Lord Bute had inveighed against party corruption, he, in common with Mr. Henry Fox, the ministerial leader in the House of Commons, is believed to have had frequent recourse to that method of securing votes in Parliament. Intimidation was employed on a large scale; the lords-lieutenant of several counties were dismissed. The name of the Duke of Devonshire was erased by the king himself from the list of privy councillors, and a mean and tyrannical persecution blasted the humble

¹ Macaulay's essay 'On Frederick the Great,' 'Essays,' iii. 286.

² Macaulay's second essay 'On Lord Chatham.'

fortunes of numerous clerks and petty officials whose patrons had objected to the peace.’¹ In spite of a long and powerful speech from Pitt, a large majority voted in favour of the peace. Great was the exultation at court, and the princess-mother exclaimed, ‘Now my son is really king.’ But the triumph was premature. The minister’s unpopularity was soon after increased by a proposed tax on cider, which excited great discontent in Herefordshire and Worcestershire, and Lord Bute at length recoiled before demonstrations of hatred which had made him so fearful of an attack in the streets that he engaged a band of pugilists to follow him at a safe distance for his protection. Suddenly, on April 7, it was announced to an astonished world that Lord Bute found his health unequal to the fatigues of his position, and on the next day he resigned all his employments. He had lately inherited a princely property from his father-in-law, and, shrinking from the storm of invective which assailed him, he hoped with less danger both to himself and his royal patron to retain his private influence over his sovereign’s future councils. But a cry was speedily raised against those politicians termed ‘the king’s friends,’ who professed to be independent of party, and Bute’s unpopularity and the suspicion of his influence were so enduring that for some years all the chief ministers appointed claimed from the king an assurance that he would not consult Lord Bute. ‘Seldom,’ says Lord Stanhope, ‘has any minister with so short a tenure of power, and with so little of guilt in his intentions, been the cause of such evils. Within a year and a half, he had lost the king his popularity, and the kingdom its allies.’² Although more than half a century had passed since the legal union of England and Scotland, national prejudice was still strong between the two countries, and so much was the hostility against the Scots aggravated by this antipathy towards Lord Bute, that the king’s uncle, the Duke of Cumberland, on the score of his former severity, became, before his death, somewhat of a popular character.

On the accession to the Treasury of George Grenville, who, although nearly connected with Pitt, was most frequently his political opponent, another stormy period began. A British ‘Seven Years’ War,’ as it was designated by the wits of the day, on account of its length, was now waged by the

¹ See Macaulay ‘On Chatham,’ and Stanhope, v. 23. These writers agree concerning the ‘reckless arrogance of power,’ shown in so many instances of persecution; but Lord Stanhope expresses some doubts concerning the lavish purchase of votes in Parliament of which the Tories were accused.

² Stanhope’s History, iv. 202.

ministry and the king against freedom of debate as represented by the able but immoral John Wilkes.

Wilkes, who was member of Parliament for Aylesbury, had set up as a political adventurer, and published a weekly paper, called 'The North Briton,' which had a large circulation. Forty-four numbers of this paper had appeared before Bute resigned, nearly all of which contained aspersions upon the prime minister and the Scots, yet so far had escaped prosecution. But when, on April 23, No. 45 appeared, commenting bitterly upon the king's speech just read in Parliament, and describing it as the speech of the new minister, Mr. Grenville determined to prove that the prerogative could not be thus safely assailed.¹ On the 30th of the month Wilkes was arrested by the authority of a 'general warrant,' a warrant not specifying any person by name, but directed against the 'authors, printers, and publishers' of the paper complained of. He was sent to the Tower and confined with unusual severity, being at first denied the use of pen and paper, and his papers were seized and examined. He lost no time in taking measures for his defence; applied to the Court of Common Pleas for a writ of Habeas Corpus, and pleaded before the chief justice on May 3. Wilkes was led back to the Tower amidst the acclamations of the mob, and was summoned again to Westminster, three days after, to hear the judgment of the court, which declared the privilege of a member of Parliament to be sufficient protection against arrest, except in cases where an actual breach of the peace had been committed, and that Mr. Wilkes consequently must be discharged.

This, the first victory obtained over the government, was celebrated with enthusiasm both in London and in the cider counties. Wilkes set up a printing-press in his own house in order to disseminate his clever but profligate writings. A copy of a poem, of which only a few copies had been printed, was obtained by the government and exhibited in the House of Lords; the complaint against the celebrated No. 45 was renewed, and it was determined by large majorities in Parliament that the obnoxious paper should be burnt by the common hangman. On December 3, when the officers proceeded to the Royal Exchange to execute this decree, a riot ensued which nearly prevented its performance, and before the paper had been destroyed, 'a jack-boot and a petticoat,' the offensive types by which the populace stigmatised Lord Bute and the princess-mother, were committed to the flames.

¹ Stanhope, v. 30.

The cry of the multitude was 'Wilkes and Liberty for ever!' and it was said that the tumult was encouraged by gentlemen looking on from the adjacent windows.¹

Wilkes next gained an important legal victory. He brought an action against the under-secretary of state for the seizure of his papers, and Chief Justice Pratt delivered a charge in his favour, upon which £1,000 damages were awarded him by the jury. The question of the legality of 'general warrants' was discussed in Parliament, and on one occasion the ministry, in a very full House, was supported by only fourteen votes. Grenville showed the despotic character of the government by depriving General Conway of his regiment, a brave and experienced officer, who, although not usually in opposition, voted on this occasion with the minority.²

Wilkes, after being wounded in a duel, withdrew to France. After a long and severe debate, the House of Commons expelled him from their assembly, and some months afterwards, when he failed to appear in answer to indictments, he was declared an outlaw by the courts.

Early in 1765, Mr. Grenville proposed to the House of Commons that a stamp duty, similar to that raised in England, should be levied in the British colonies of North America. He urged that the colonies might fairly be required to pay a part of the sums which had during the late war been expended in their defence. The amount which was expected to be gained by this tax did not exceed £100,000 per annum; but the measure was called 'an experiment towards further aid from America,' Mr. Grenville disregarding the objection that the colonies, if taxed by Great Britain, might claim to be represented in the British Parliament. Mr. Pitt was at this time absent, from illness, and little opposition was made in Parliament to the proposal. But as soon as the intention was made known in America the excitement was prodigious. The offensive Act of Parliament was reprinted with a death's-head in place of the royal arms; at Boston the flags were hoisted half-mast high, as a sign of mourning, and the church bells tolled a funeral knell.

The assembly of Virginia drew up a petition to the king, declaring that England did not possess the right of taxing the

¹ Stanhope, v. 48.

² This very arbitrary act was ascribed to the king himself. Colonel Barré, Lord Shelburne, and others were also deprived of their commissions at the same time, and for the same reason.—See Phillimore's 'History of George III.,' p. 384.

colonies without their own consent, and claiming on the score of justice that the Act should be immediately repealed.

By way of retaliation, the Americans determined to buy as little as possible of the goods manufactured in England, and to encourage their own manufactures. They carried this resolution so far as to agree not to eat lamb, in order that wool for their own manufactures might be the more plentiful, and they took pleasure in restricting their wardrobes till they could be furnished with home-spun garments made in America.¹ It was at this very period, when the irritated colonists were rejecting articles of English manufacture, that the manufacturers of England were so far improving in skill that in the course of a few years they added greatly to the national wealth, and laid the foundation of new towns in districts hitherto unpeopled.

It was in 1763 that Mr. Wedgwood, then an artisan in Staffordshire, first invented a kind of common earthenware which proved superior to that which had been imported from France and Holland. The prosperity of the district called 'the Potteries' dates from this time. In the early part of the eighteenth century the commerce of England had been nearly confined to woollen manufactures; but, in 1769 and 1770, the inventions of Arkwright, Hargreaves, and Crompton, led to truly wonderful improvements in cotton goods. As yet steam-power was undeveloped, but the canals which had been formed by the Duke of Bridgewater furnished a new channel for the transport of goods from the manufacturing towns to London and the south. Had it not been for the improvement of British manufactures, this country could not have endured the heavy strain to which it was subjected for the ensuing fifty years.

The Americans who first formed associations to exclude British manufactures announced that the prohibition would only last until the obnoxious Stamp Act should be repealed. Already, however, some of their leaders asserted republican principles and desired to cast off all political connexion with the mother country. When the ships arrived from England with the stamped papers, crowds assembled at several ports eager to prevent their employment, and it was found necessary in most of the colonies to suspend their use.² England was alarmed by the danger of civil war and the loss of her

¹ See Stanhope's History, v. 137, for the examination of Dr. Franklin, at the bar of the House of Commons in 1766.

² Stanhope, v. 127.

commerce. Mr. Grenville fell from power in July, 1765, and was succeeded by the Marquis of Rockingham, under whom General Conway, so lately dismissed with ignominy by Grenville, became secretary of state and leader of the House of Commons. The celebrity of Lord Rockingham's administration in the annals of the last century was not the consequence of that nobleman's personal ability, but due rather to the important measure which he passed, as also to the great talent of some of his supporters. His ministry called the attention of Parliament to the critical state of the North American colonies. On January 14, 1766, Mr. Pitt, who had been absent from the House of Commons for nearly a year, reappeared, and in a memorable speech denied the right of Great Britain to tax America internally without her consent. After censuring the late tumults in the colonies, he declared that he rejoiced that America had resisted—that her 'three millions of people' (so small was then the population) 'were not so dead to the feelings of liberty as voluntarily to submit to be slaves.'

The ministers who then held office had not approved of the Stamp Act, and were entirely averse to supporting it by military force. They were, however, opposed by that unauthorised party called 'the king's friends,' and could not be blind to the danger of making a concession when it was demanded under threats of rebellion. Petitions from London, Liverpool, Bristol, and other large towns, covered the table of the House, bearing statements that the colonists owed several millions sterling to English merchants, and had always paid their debts faithfully, and that the suspension of traffic owing to the Stamp Act would be the ruin of trade.

The evidence of several persons well acquainted with America was heard by the House, the most eminent of the witnesses who appeared at the bar being Dr. Franklin, who had been for the second time sent over by the Assembly of Pennsylvania to endeavour to adjust their differences. The voice of the celebrated Edmund Burke was first heard in Parliament on this important question. The son of an Irish attorney, Burke was a literary adventurer until the Marquis of Rockingham appointed him his private secretary, and he obtained by the same influence a seat for Wendover. The House overflowed with deeply interested listeners, merchants from many towns thronging the gallery, when Conway proposed to repeal the Stamp Act, urging the danger of attempting to enforce it upon 150,000 fighting men, and the further danger, in case their discontent should abide, that the mal-

contents might be protected by both France and Spain.¹ Pitt again exerted his eloquence upon the same side, and, to the delight of the assembled multitude, a large majority supported the proposed repeal.

Conway was welcomed out of doors by loud cheers; and, on the approach of 'the great Commoner,' every head was uncovered, and many persons testified their respect by accompanying Pitt's chair to his home, while a storm of hisses assailed Grenville. In the House of Lords, although a formidable party opposed the repeal, it was carried by a majority of thirty-four. The ministers thought it conducive to the maintenance of British dignity to add a declaration that the legislative authority of Parliament was in all cases supreme over the whole empire. This declaration was opposed in the House of Commons by Mr. Pitt, almost alone. Although he had declared in the strongest terms the sovereign authority of Great Britain over the colonies, he denied the legality of levying taxes on those who were unrepresented.²

Some persons still feared future dissensions in consequence of the 'Declaratory Act,' but its words were scarcely regarded during the exultation with which the repeal of the obnoxious Act was received in America. The colonists, however, had become aware of their growing strength, and were emboldened to future remonstrances and resistance.

Those interesting debates in the House of Commons concerning America were not made known to the world by any newspaper, but were transcribed by two Irish gentlemen, whose report was published as a pamphlet, which, to escape the censor, had the appearance of being printed at Paris. The first regular Parliamentary reports appeared in the monthly magazines, but the names of the speakers were indicated only by initials. The repeal of the Stamp Act was the chief measure of Lord Rockingham's short administration. A resolution was also passed condemning the use of general warrants, and another which condemned the seizure of papers in cases of libel.³ It was much to have averted civil war, to have begun a conciliatory policy which would have prevented the subsequent animosity of America.

Only a few months after the repeal of the Stamp Act, a change took place in the government. Mr. Pitt was raised to

¹ 'Thus early,' says Lord Stanhope, 'was the final result foreseen.'

² Lord Macaulay explains his reasons for some difference with Pitt, and declares the Stamp Act indefensible, not because illegal, but because unjust and impolitic.—
'Essays,' iii. 513.

³ Macaulay's 'Essays,' iii. 518, and Stanhope, v. 146.

the peerage with the title of Earl of Chatham, being urged to take part in the new ministry; but owing to ill-health he withdrew from public affairs, passed the greater part of 1767-1768 in strict seclusion, and in October, 1768, retired finally from office.¹

It was at this time, when Lord Chatham had withdrawn from public affairs, that the contest between Mr. Wilkes and the government was renewed. He had resided on the continent for about four years, when, in March, 1768, he ventured, although an outlaw, to return to England to come forward as a candidate for the representation of London. Defeated in that election, he offered himself to the electors of Middlesex, and was returned as one of their members by a large majority. Serious riots occurred at both elections, but Wilkes, desiring to keep the letter of the law, surrendered and was committed to custody. On June 8, Lord Mansfield pronounced his outlawry void owing to a legal flaw, but he was sentenced to two years' imprisonment, and to pay two fines of £500 on account of the obnoxious number of the 'North Briton,' and a poem which had been previously condemned.² On the day of his arrest Wilkes was rescued by an admiring crowd; the people took the horses from his carriage and drew him to a tavern at Cornhill, trusting that he would defy the law, but he wisely withdrew quietly, and surrendered himself a prisoner at the King's Bench. A new writ was issued for Middlesex, and again Wilkes was re-elected; this form was again repeated, the House having resolved against the election of a member previously expelled. Another election ensuing, Colonel Luttrell was brought forward as the ministerial candidate, but he obtained only three hundred votes, whilst Wilkes had been supported by eleven hundred in the course of a few hours, and was for the fourth time proclaimed the knight of the metropolitan county. A large party of the freeholders went on horseback, with banners and music, to the King's Bench prison to congratulate Wilkes upon his triumph; large subscriptions were raised for the payment of his fines and private debts, and presents of all kinds were heaped upon him. But still the ministers were resolved to exclude Wilkes from the coveted seat in the House of Commons, and, in spite of the disparity of votes, declared Luttrell the duly elected member.

Long and fierce discussions took place in the House, and

¹ Although nominally prime minister, Lord Chatham had only accepted for himself the custody of the Privy Seal.

² Stanhope, v. 194.

the excitement out of doors was extreme, for the conflict was felt to be no longer between Wilkes and the ministers, but between the great body of the electors of Middlesex and the Parliament acting under the king's direction. So great was the king's anxiety during these proceedings that he was immediately informed of the result of every division.¹ In the autumn of 1769 the long-pending action brought by Wilkes against Lord Halifax for the seizure of his papers was decided in his favour, the sum of £4,000 being awarded him as damages, which, although considerable, by no means satisfied the people of London.

In April, 1770, Wilkes was discharged from confinement on giving his bond for good behaviour. The people were eager to form a triumphal procession in his honour, but he prudently withdrew for a few days into the country, and on his return was installed in his new office of alderman of London. The lord mayor of that year was William Beckford, who was honoured by the friendship of Lord Chatham, but who presented to the king a petition and remonstrance which reflected severely on the counsels by which the sovereign had lately been guided. The city of London has always prided itself on its right to present addresses to the king in state, a privilege which it shares with the Parliament and the universities. There were many grievances at this period against which thinking men might desire to remonstrate.

During the first ten years of this reign seats in Parliament were increasingly objects of traffic. Lord Chesterfield complained in his correspondence that the competition of rich men from the East and West Indies had so raised the price that he had in vain offered £2,500 for a place in the House of Commons. A great number of seats were the property of persons of influence who caused their favourites to be returned under the forms of a popular election; and in other cases bribery, although illegal, was not concealed. Before the dissolution of Parliament in 1768, the mayor and aldermen of Oxford assured their members that they would insure their re-election provided they would discharge the debts of the corporation, amounting to £7,500. The members for Oxford laid the case before the House, who committed the mayor and aldermen to

¹ Massey's 'History of England,' i. 170. A motion was made in the House of Commons, in order to frustrate these repeated attempts, that, having been once expelled, Wilkes was incapable of being returned to the same Parliament. This was opposed by Burke, Sir George Savile, and other leading men of the Opposition, but carried by a large majority. The popular favour rose still higher, and a subscription was immediately made in his favour.—Stanhope, v. 229.

Newgate, but dismissed them from imprisonment after five days, on their acknowledging their guilt, with a reprimand from the Speaker.

Venality had become so common that it appeared impossible to prevent conduct which was not considered even disgraceful. A warm conflict took place between the House of Commons and the Corporation of London concerning the publication of the debates, reports of which had lately appeared in the newspapers. Some members loudly complained of this as a breach of privilege, whereupon the printers of these reports were summoned to the House of Commons, and required to kneel at the bar to listen to the reprimand of the Speaker. A printer, named Miller, refused to attend the summons, claiming his rights as a free-man of London; the House sent a messenger to arrest him, and a scuffle ensued. Miller accused the messenger of assaulting him, and brought the complaint before the lord mayor, who required the messenger to give bail for the alleged assault.

Irritated by this defiance, the House sent the lord mayor, named Brass Crosby, and Alderman Oliver, who had confirmed his decision, to the Tower, although both were members of Parliament. The king was greatly excited on this occasion, and wrote to his minister, Lord North, that it was 'highly necessary that this strange and lawless method of publishing debates in the papers should be put a stop to.' 'If the lord mayor and Oliver be not committed,' wrote George III., 'the authority of the House of Commons is annihilated.'¹

The confinement of the two magistrates did not last many weeks. On May 8, 1771, they were released, when Parliament was prorogued, and a splendid procession accompanied the lord mayor and aldermen from the Tower to the Mansion House. Aware of the danger of interfering with the press, the House did not afterwards insist upon the prohibition, and from that period the publication of the debates has continued by the politic connivance of Parliament, although the House still retains the power of closing its doors against the public.

The satisfaction which immediately followed the repeal of the obnoxious Stamp Act was of short duration.

In 1767, when the state of Lord Chatham's health had made him incapable of attending to public affairs, a duty was imposed on tea, and on some other articles exported from England

¹ See 'Letters of George III. to his prime minister,' Lord North, given in the Appendix of Lord Stanhope's History, vol. v. The debates which took place on this important subject were particularly violent, no member exerting himself so much in defence of the liberty of the press as Edmund Burke.—Macknight's 'Life of Burke,' i. 460.

to America, and thus, for the sake of a paltry revenue, a storm of opposition was again raised which after a few years separated for ever the provinces of North America from the parent country.¹

Early in the next year, 1768, the Assembly of Massachusetts addressed a circular letter to the burgesses and representatives of the people throughout the colonies, urging them to unite in opposition to the intended measure. The British minister no sooner heard of this step than he addressed the provincial governors, urging them to use all their influence in their Houses of Assembly to prevent the effect of the appeal from Massachusetts. But home influence being apparently more regarded by the Assemblies than that of the English minister, they were dissolved. When, however, new Assemblies were summoned the next year, they proved equally intractable. Many English statesmen saw the impolicy of thus urging taxation on colonists so determined to resist it; but Lord North, who in 1770 became prime minister, unhappily adopted the view that the violence already shown in some of the provinces precluded the propriety of a second concession on the part of the English Legislature.² With a last and vain effort at conciliation, utterly disregarded by the angry colonists, Lord North prepared a bill repealing all parts of the Act of 1767, excepting that which imposed the duty on tea. And, so great was now the spirit of resistance, that the British government could only enforce its mandates by military aid; while after every encounter public meetings were called together and speeches made which still further excited the wrath of the people. When the vessels from England were expected to arrive with their cargoes of tea, their coming was awaited at various ports with feelings like those attending the approach of an enemy, with the determination that the tea should not be landed, or, at any rate, not sold in America. The most memorable explosion of wrath occurred at Boston, where, on December 16, 1773, a great number of persons, disguised as Mohawk Indians, forced themselves on board the tea-ships, broke open the chests, and flung the whole freight, which was valued at £18,000, into the sea.³ Having committed

¹ Charles Townshend was the Chancellor of the Exchequer who proposed this bill, in 1767, and notwithstanding some alarm concerning its probable consequences in America, it was carried through both Houses without opposition. For three years, notwithstanding many disputes between the provincial Legislatures and their governors, there was no serious prospect of war.

² Stanhope, v. 265.

³ *Ib.*, vi. 2. At Charleston the tea was landed but consigned to cellars, where it at length perished from damp.

this act, they dispersed quietly without further violence, but when the deed became known in England it awakened anger which could only be appeased by the punishment of the refractory port. On March 14, Lord North proposed what was called the Boston Port Bill, transferring the commerce and customs of Boston to the neighbouring port of Salem, until full compensation had been made by the delinquent city. This Act was passed, although opposed by Burke, Fox, and Lord Chatham, who said that reparation should have been demanded before Boston was condemned. The bill for destroying the commerce of Boston was generally regarded in America as an act of tyranny.

On June 1 the custom house was closed, and the provincial assembly summoned to meet at Salem. But the merchants of Salem declined to be enriched by the ruin of the principal port of their state, and the spirit of the Assembly rose so high against the British government that it was immediately dissolved by the governor.¹ The colonists then determined to hold a general congress at Philadelphia, and at the beginning of September fifty-three delegates from twelve 'states,' who were principally lawyers, attended the summons. A Declaration of Rights was drawn up, in which the colonists claimed for themselves all the privileges of Englishmen; and while they asked the British government to repeal the recent Acts, which they considered violations of their rights, they passed resolutions suspending the arrival of all imports from Great Britain and Ireland, after December 1 ensuing, and all exports in return from their own ports after the following September 10.²

When the news of these last occurrences reached England a general election was going on. The prevailing feeling was against the American colonists, who were considered refractory and perverse, and the party of the ministers was increased, although London and Middlesex took the side of opposition. Wilkes, who was returned for Middlesex without a competitor, was allowed at length to take his long-disputed seat, and was also elected lord mayor. Emerging once more from retirement, Lord Chatham announced that he should address the House of Lords on American affairs, and the bar was crowded with Americans when, on January 20, he urged with all his force the imperative necessity that 'those fatal Acts of the last

¹ Stanhope, vi. 11.

² *Ib.*, 16. One article was excepted from the latter prohibition. To propitiate Carolina, which threatened to secede from the Union if deprived of a branch of commerce so essential to her prosperity, rice was to be allowed to be sent 'to Europe.'

session' should be done away. 'You must repeal her fears and her resentments, and may then hope for the love and gratitude of America.' Already substituting the word *nation* for colony, he urged that 'all attempts to impose servitude upon such men, to establish despotism upon such a mighty continental nation, must be fatal.'

'Let us retreat,' said he, 'while we can, not when we must.' In similar language Lord Chatham proposed an address to the king, praying that, in order to allay the present ferment in America, his Majesty would direct General Gage to remove his forces as soon as possible from the town of Boston. But only a small minority supported him.¹

It appeared impossible to adjust the differences by negotiation, and on both sides preparations were made for war. Colonel Washington, who had already been an officer of militia in his native province, Virginia, was, happily for the American cause, chosen commander-in-chief. The first battle was fought at Bunker's Hill, near Boston, on June 16, 1775, with such doubtful issue as to be claimed by both sides as a victory. The Americans raised their reputation by their bravery, but their newly levied troops were wanting in military skill, while in the course of the war the calm resolution of Washington was severely taxed to supply the numerous deficiencies of the service. Some unusual acts on the part of the English aggravated the anger of the enemy. One of these was the burning of some of their towns, a step unsanctioned by the government at home; another, the employment of mercenary soldiers obtained from the petty princes of Germany, with the still more objectionable addition of wild American Indians, who increased the horrors of war by their barbarous usages.² By degrees a resolution prevailed among the leading Americans to carry on the war until they should obtain a complete separation from Great Britain, and an embassy was privately sent to France to arrange an alliance with the French government. It was on July 4, just one year after the battle of Bunker's Hill, that the Congress published that 'Declaration of Independence' from which Americans date the dawn of their political freedom. 'From that date,' say their historians, 'the word *colonies* disappears from our history.'³ By Washington's order, the 'Declaration' was read at the head of every regiment. Success long appeared uncertain. New York and Philadelphia fell into the hands of the English, and to such straits were the American

¹ Stanhope, vi. 23.

² *Ib.*, vi. 86-89.

³ See Sparks's 'Life of Washington,' p. 182.

troops reduced that they were at times compelled to march without shoes, and left on the snow the traces of their bleeding feet. But the firmness of Washington, under many trying vicissitudes, at length crowned the arms of his country with deserved success. The rumour that France might be induced to aid the Americans in their contest excited Lord Chatham to renew his efforts to terminate what he termed 'this unnatural war.' He told the House of Lords that during the last three years England had been teaching the Americans the art of war, and that they had proved apt scholars. So long as America had not yet allied herself with France, Chatham felt that England's point of honour was still secure, and that she might frankly acknowledge herself to have been the aggressor. When, again, in the autumn of 1777, it became known in England that General Burgoyne, the commander of the British forces, was very hard pressed by the Americans, Lord Chatham proposed on the first day of the session to address the king in favour of peace. He again repeated the words, 'My lords, you cannot conquer America! You may swell every expense still more extravagantly, traffic with every little pitiful German prince who sells his subjects;' and, after censuring the employment of the Indians with still greater vehemence, he declared, 'If I were an American, as I am an Englishman, while a foreign troop was landed in my country, I never would lay down my arms, never, never.'¹

At the time when Lord Chatham spoke thus, Burgoyne had surrendered at Saratoga to the American General Gates. The British troops were allowed to march out with the honours of war, and, to soften the discomfiture, the treaty of surrender was termed a convention. But the consequences of this humiliation of the British army were much more momentous than the immediate misfortune of an officer who was ill-provided and beset by greater numbers.

A strong desire had been already felt in the higher circles of France to aid the Americans, and many Frenchmen had enrolled themselves in Washington's army without waiting for the approval of their own government; the most noted of these volunteers was the young Marquis de la Fayette, who received the rank of major-general. When the news of Burgoyne's surrender reached Europe, the King of France no longer hesitated

¹ Stanhope's History, vi. 199. It was said by the Duke of Grafton, who listened to this speech, that the eloquence of Lord Chatham's appeals appeared to him to surpass 'all that we have ever heard of the celebrated orators of Greece or Rome. *Ib.*, 203.

on entering into alliance with America, stipulating that the United States should never, under any condition, return to their former dependence on Great Britain. When, early in May, 1778, the treaty of alliance was brought to America, the day was kept with the solemnities of a national thanksgiving, volleys being fired in honour of 'the thirteen states,' with loud cheers for the King of France.¹

Roused too late to an understanding of their perilous position, the English ministry at last sent commissioners to offer to the Americans every concession compatible with the supremacy of England, but their terms were promptly rejected.

On gaining the powerful alliance of France, the Americans lost their eloquent champion in the English senate.

Heartily as Lord Chatham had sympathised with the colonies, he could not approve their separation from England, and he now contemplated with indignation and dismay their alliance with that nation which he looked upon as England's hereditary foe. On April 7, 1778, when the Duke of Richmond proposed an address to the king praying that the British troops should be removed from the thirteen revolted provinces, Lord Chatham, rising from a bed of sickness, appeared for the last time in the House of Lords to protest against concessions which would involve 'the dismemberment of the British Empire.' The duke, in reply, urged the policy of retaining friendly relations with the Americans, and the impossibility of still holding them in subjection. Lord Chatham again rose, but fell back in a state of insensibility and was borne to a neighbouring house by his friends. He only rallied sufficiently to be removed after a few days to his own country house at Hayes, where he expired on May 11, in his seventieth year. It was immediately determined by Parliament that the remains of the great statesman should be interred at the public expense, and the earl's statue in the northern transept of Westminster Abbey marks the spot. Although the king's aversion to 'the great Commoner' still remained unsubdued, the confidence in his policy entertained by the majority of Englishmen would probably, had his life been prolonged, have recalled him once more to a place in the administration.²

During the summer of 1779, Spain joined the league against

¹ Stanhope, vi. 244. The first twelve states which united to repel the authority of Great Britain had become thirteen in the summer of 1775, by the accession of the province of Georgia.—Ib., vi. 63.

² See Stanhope, vi. 224–226. The king expressed more surprise than satisfaction at the vote of Parliament for a public funeral and monument in honour of Lord Chatham. See Appendix to vol. vi. page lx.

England. The position thus taken by two despotic monarchies in allying themselves with the new American Republic was strange; the motive was plainly not the wish to encourage freedom in America, but to seize the opportunity of abasing their old rival. 'The House of Bourbon,' says Macaulay, 'humbled to the dust a few years before by the genius of Chatham, had seized the opportunity of revenge.'¹ A hostile fleet, larger than any which had appeared in the British Channel since the time of the Armada, again menaced the coast of England, and the admirals of France and Spain discussed with vehemence whether, according to the Spanish plan, to land an invading army immediately, or, as the Frenchman advised, first to attack and defeat the British fleet.

It was plainly the duty of the English government to increase the fleet; but to obtain sailors was difficult, and an Act was passed making it legal to impress even the fishermen and apprentices who had been hitherto exempt from service. Strong appeals were made in the House of Commons against this extension of the press-gang, which appeared so contrary to the habits and so inconsistent with the laws of England, but the necessity for manning the navy silenced opposition.²

The allied commanders, however, were so aware of the defective state of their ships as to dread the approaching equinoctial gales, and malignant illness among the crews warned them of the necessity of returning to their own harbours before they had struck the intended blow against England. Yet now the naval pride of England suffered a smart rebuff from Paul Jones, by birth a Scotsman, who held a commission in the American service, and who, with a squadron of four vessels, attacked the convoy of English traders from the Baltic, carrying off two British ships as prizes after a very sharp encounter. He had indeed already ventured to enter the Firth of Forth, and the Scottish magistrates were still in deliberation whether or not to grant arms to Highlanders for the defence of their capital, when a brisk gale from the west fortunately drove off the intruders.³ Jones shortly afterwards visited Paris, where he received a splendid sword from Louis XVI. in consideration of his prowess.

¹ 'Biography of Pitt,' p. 149.

² Stanhope, vi. 265.

³ Stanhope, vi. 271. Sir Walter Scott described from memory the alarm and humiliation felt by the citizens of Edinburgh at the threatened attack in the days of his boyhood. Paul Jones died at Paris in 1792, having outlived the popular applause which was excited by his singular and successful daring.

The distress which the war was bringing on the Americans was very great; the paper money which circulated amongst them was excessively depreciated, and the price of all commodities became exorbitant. But yet a new danger now threatened England on the side of Ireland, which had been aroused to a keener sense of its many grievances by the boldness of America. In 1778, Lord Nugent proposed a bill for relieving Ireland from those unjust restrictions which depressed the profits upon Irish goods and very nearly stopped their export at times when they might have competed in the market with the English. Ireland, it was suggested, being less heavily taxed, could manufacture cheaper, and in the interest of England it was necessary to counterbalance the advantage.

A majority of the House of Commons assented to the justice of this appeal, but the traders of the great manufacturing towns, alarmed at the prospect of free trade and supported by the king's narrow policy, caused the postponement of the proposed concessions.¹ Edmund Burke on this occasion endeavoured to recommend wiser as well as more liberal doctrines of political economy. It was not altogether in vain that the cry of 'Justice to Ireland' was now first raised in England. After the fierce civil war of the reign of William III., when the Irish Catholics were generally considered to be disaffected to the English government, a bill was passed to prevent Catholics from holding the lands lately forfeited, and giving to a younger brother, if Protestant, a superior right to that of his elder brother who still held to the Catholic faith. This statute, which was entitled an 'Act for preventing the further growth of Popery,' might, as was observed, have been styled an 'Act for preventing the growth of family affection and for the encouragement of hypocrisy and meanness.' It was now repealed, not, however, without remonstrances on the part of the king.²

During the panic caused by the threatened invasion of the allied fleets, the English forces in Ireland had been greatly reduced, and the city of Belfast appealed in vain to the Irish

¹ In a letter to his minister, Lord North, in March, 1778, George III. warned him against 'granting too many advantages of trade to Ireland.' See Appendix to Lord Stanhope's sixth vol.

² Burke, after assisting in the repeal, addressed his Catholic fellow-countrymen in terms of exultation: 'You may now,' he said, 'raise your heads and think yourselves men. You are now, for the first time, acknowledged and protected as subjects. Laws, indeed, cannot make men rich or happy. That they must do for themselves. But the law now leaves their natural faculties free.'—Macknight's 'Life of Burke,' ii. 246. An opportunity was soon afforded to the youth of Ireland to show themselves 'men.' The advice also given by Burke that they should show themselves 'modest and placable towards former opponents,' was not so readily adopted.

government for more troops for its protection. In this emergency the Irish determined to undertake the defence of their own coast, and before the autumn of 1779 a volunteer force amounting to 40,000 men had been disciplined under the direction of Irish noblemen and gentry. Dublin exulted in a new feeling of national power when, in October, 1779, the volunteers lined the streets through which the members of the Irish House of Commons passed to address the lord lieutenant in favour of free trade.¹ Although some riots accompanied this display of popular strength, it was deemed hazardous to delay reform, and the restrictions on trade were relaxed.

Discontent also prevailed in England when an extraordinary aid was demanded of Parliament for the king's use, although the personal habits of both George III. and his queen were frugal even to a degree inconsistent with their dignity. It was believed in fact that the profuse expenditure had been employed for political influence. The king was active as a party-leader, daily scrutinising the votes of the House of Commons, and taking opportunities to reward or punish the members. The pension-list was a powerful means of corruption, and many members who were the nominal representatives of extinct or insignificant boroughs were completely under the direction of the government.² On one of the last days of 1779, a great county meeting was held at York, when a petition against the alleged abuses in the national expenditure, and for the abolition of useless offices, was unanimously adopted. Other meetings took place with the same views, and great was the public interest when in February the Yorkshire petition was presented to the House of Commons, followed by speeches of unrivalled eloquence from Burke on the subject of economical reform. A majority of the House assented to his plan of retrenchment, and a change in the administration appeared to be impending, when court influence was exerted, and triumphed by obtaining a majority of fifty-three votes. The matter was not allowed to rest. Mr. Dunning, one of the most eminent lawyers, renewed the subject in the House on April 6, asking whence it could arise that the plans so lately approved had been afterwards rejected. Influence from without must have been employed, and he concluded by proposing the celebrated resolution, 'that the influence of the crown has increased, is increasing, and ought to be diminished,' which was carried in a crowded House by a majority of thirteen. The joy

¹ See Hardy's 'Life of Lord Charlemont,' i. 392.

² See Massey's 'History of England,' i. 529.

of the people was unbounded. The names of those who voted in the majority were published, and meetings were held to express thanks for their services. It was, indeed, confidently hoped that court influence had received its death-blow.¹

That no great result followed this memorable night, and that Burke's efforts to obtain economical reform were after all frustrated, might be partly the effect of court influence, but it also resulted from a recoil from extreme views to which moderate men were averse. A clamour was arising in favour of Parliamentary reform, and there were, even in the House of Lords, some advocates of 'universal suffrage and annual Parliaments.' Burke did not desire to re-model the House of Commons. The opposition which his liberal views respecting trade had met from the electors of Bristol inspired him with anxiety at the anticipation of attempts to transfer the preponderating influence from the aristocracy, the patrons of close boroughs, to ignorant men who were misled by their fancied interests.

In a country more arbitrarily governed, the attempt to limit the increasing power of the crown might have been followed by a *coup d'état* which would have closed the doors of the national assembly for a period of years. But this could not be in England, where constitutional government was too firmly established for any danger of such an attempt as that of Charles I. But a violent outbreak of party zeal against religious liberty came unexpectedly to the aid of the court party, and assisted in deferring for many years the reforms which had appeared so near their accomplishment. The penal laws affecting the Roman Catholics had lately undergone revision and mitigation at the hands of Parliament, and this aroused the bigotry of the Protestant zealots. Lord George Gordon, who presided over a London society nominally instituted for the protection of Protestantism, had already shown signs of an unsound mind by his violent speeches in Parliament. Through his influence, a hundred and fifty thousand signatures were affixed to a petition against any further concessions to Papists, and Lord George made an inflammatory appeal, urging that at least 20,000 persons should attend him through the streets on June 2, when he intended to present the petition to the House. It was computed that nearly 60,000 persons, wearing his badge, the blue cockade, attended at Lord George's summons.

¹ Macknight's 'Life of Burke,' ii. 346.

The government, though forewarned, remained supine, and the immense procession which reached Palace-yard obstructed the passage of the members, even demolishing the carriages and endangering the safety of some of the peers and bishops. It happened that the tumult out of doors interrupted the speech of the Duke of Richmond, who was proposing a bill to introduce 'universal suffrage' at the very moment when a fanatical mob was setting all order at defiance. The two Houses adjourned, and the mob retired, but the rioters continued on several successive days and nights to bring the whole capital into peril. The Catholic chapels of the Sardinian and Bavarian ministers were set on fire, as were also Newgate and Clerkenwell prisons, the prisoners being liberated; and the furniture and library of Chief Justice Mansfield, at his residence in Bloomsbury Square, were completely destroyed. The arrival of troops at last restored order, and, on June 9, Lord George Gordon was sent to the Tower on a charge of high treason.

Sir Samuel Romilly, writing at this time, describes London as for two nights resembling a city taken by storm. Fires were blazing in different districts, and while part of the inhabitants were struck with terror, the rest were inflamed by every lawless passion. Order, however, was speedily restored, and very soon the ruins of houses and churches alone remained to testify to the frightful scenes which had occasioned so much ruin and disgrace.¹ The hostility towards Chief-Justice Mansfield was kindled by his liberal protection of Dissenters, and by his exertions in defence of a Roman Catholic priest; the violent partisans of what they termed 'the Protestant cause' stigmatising all the advocates of religious liberty as infidels or Papists. The king showed during this time of peril more resolution than his ministers, and, by the advice of the attorney-general, signed a warrant to authorise the employment of soldiers in the defence of the public peace. The amount of injury to private dwellings was estimated at £130,000. A hundred and thirty-five rioters were condemned and executed. The trial of Lord George Gordon was deferred till the following February, when he was defended by Erskine, then just entering on his career, and was acquitted. 'There can be no doubt,' says Lord Campbell, 'that the acts of the insurgents during the last days of the riots did amount to high treason;' but, although Lord George had headed the procession and had used most intemperate language, which excited the mob to violence, he had afterwards attempted to control them. Dangerous and criminal

¹ See 'Memoir of Sir S. Romilly,' ii. 93.

as his conduct had been, Lord George could not be properly convicted of 'levying war or compassing the king's death,' which is by law constituted high treason.¹ Mr. Burke, whose house had been in danger, after the restoration of order exerted himself to uphold that principle of religious liberty set at nought by the people in their frantic ignorance, as well as to abate the sanguinary punishments to which so many unthinking men had laid themselves open. 'Men,' he observed, 'who see their lives respected by others, come to respect that gift of God themselves. I believe it will be found that conspiracies have been most common and most desperate when their punishment has been most severe.'² The effect of these disturbances was to discourage all efforts for reform; they consequently strengthened the hands of the administration.

The war with America continued to be waged with varying fortune, the British generals finding by experience that to conquer in battle was not to subdue their opponents.

William Pitt, second son of the great Lord Chatham, who now, at the age of twenty-two, was beginning his career, denounced in strong terms the continuance of that war. The English were at war with France, Spain, and Holland, as well as with America. A general feeling of the hopelessness of the attempt to re-establish British sway in America had been increasing, when, towards the end of November, 1781, the news which arrived in England, of the surrender of Lord Cornwallis with six thousand soldiers, at last shook the confidence of the English minister. It was in the latter part of September that Lord Cornwallis, the British commander, found himself surrounded at York-town, in Virginia, by a far superior army of French and Americans commanded by General Washington, and supported by a fleet. No relief arriving, and escape being impossible, Cornwallis, like Burgoyne, was compelled to surrender after a fortnight's siege. Washington showed the respectful forbearance of a generous opponent, by keeping all intrusive spectators at a distance, when the English veterans had the bitter mortification of laying down their arms to become prisoners of war.³

On the arrival of this disastrous intelligence, Lord North, who had for some time maintained the contest in submission to the king's wishes, although with a doubtful mind, exclaimed with anguish, 'All is indeed over!' But George III. still con-

¹ Campbell's 'Life of Lord Mansfield,' p. 531.

² Macknight's 'Life of Burke,' ii. 380.

³ Stanhope, vii. 122.

tinued to declare that nothing should induce him to consent to peace at the price of the separation of the colonies from the government of Great Britain.¹ Immediately after receiving the ill news, the king opened Parliament with a speech calling for the vigorous and united exertions of his subjects, and breathing no word of concession. Fox, who moved an amendment to the address, was warmly supported by Burke. 'Oh, valuable rights,' exclaimed he, 'that have cost England thirteen provinces, four islands, a hundred thousand men, and more than seventy millions of money.' Four of the West India islands had been taken by the French, and news had also been received from the Mediterranean of the loss of Minorca.

The force of public opinion had at length an effect on the majorities of the House of Commons, and on February 27 a resolution to petition the king against any further attempt to reduce 'the insurgent colonies' was carried against the whole power of government.² A few hours after this memorable debate, Burke wrote as follows to Dr. Franklin: 'I congratulate you as the friend of America, I trust as not the enemy of England, I am sure as the friend of mankind, on the resolution of the House of Commons, carried by a majority of nineteen at two o'clock this morning in a very full House. It was the declaration of two hundred and thirty-four; I think it was the opinion of the whole. I trust that it will lead to a speedy peace between the two branches of the English nation, perhaps to a general peace, and that our happiness may be an introduction to that of the world at large.'³ There was greater joy in London at this peaceful victory than had been testified for any success during the war, and the Funds, which had been long depressed, began to rise. A change of ministry was inevitable. George III. wrote that 'the fatal day' had come, and that the 'sudden change of sentiments in the House of Commons' compelled him to change his ministers.⁴

The Marquis of Rockingham, who, during his short administration in 1766, had endeavoured to conciliate America, became the head of the new ministry. The Duke of Richmond and Mr. Fox took office under him, and Burke had the less important post of paymaster of the forces. The king had declared

¹ See the letters of the king to Lord North.—Lord Brougham's 'Statesmen,' i. 160.

² Stanhope, vii. 137.

³ Macknight's 'Life of Burke,' ii. 483.

⁴ See the king's letter to Lord George Germain, in the Appendix of Lord Stanhope's seventh vol.

with apparent earnestness that, rather than submit to such a change he would resign his crown and retire to Hanover. No member of the House of Commons, according to impartial writers, contributed so much to this great victory, won 'first over popular prepossessions, and then over royal obstinacy,' as Burke.¹

Justice to Ireland was the next great subject of debate. Mr. Fox moved the repeal of the obnoxious Act of George I., which had been passed at the time when there was a Popish pretender to the throne; and he obtained concessions which gratified the patriotic party, although still leaving a domineering Protestant ascendancy.

Pitt now strongly urged the necessity for reform in the election of members, in which he was supported by Fox. The motion for inquiry was lost by a majority of twenty votes, and was deferred for fifty years. The acknowledged grievances which the reformers sought to remedy in 1782 continued unredressed until 1831.

Many months passed before that peace was concluded which was Lord Rockingham's main desire. In April, 1782, the naval victory won by Admiral Rodney saved Jamaica from the French, and diffused general satisfaction. The attention of all Europe had been fixed on Gibraltar, besieged more than three years by the Spaniards and French, and defended with great courage and skill by General Elliot. The King of Spain eagerly desired to reunite to his dominions that barren rock, of which the English had been in possession for nearly eighty years, and two French princes hastened towards the spot, confidently expecting the success of the attack. But red-hot shot from the ramparts demolished the mighty towers raised by the French engineers, and in October Lord Howe succeeded in bringing to the besieged garrison the reinforcements which they urgently needed, and which decided the successful resistance of the garrison.

The death of the Marquis of Rockingham having broken up the administration, the peace negotiations were begun in January, 1783, during the short-lived ministry of Lord Shelburne. The king declared in his speech to Parliament that he had sacrificed every consideration of his own to the wishes and opinions of his people, a final expression of his repugnance to the independence of America which was much censured by the Opposition. But when Mr. Adams, the first ambassador from the United States, was presented at the English court, George III. received him with a frank dignity which produced

¹ Notice of Burke in Portrait Gallery, by Arthur Hallam.

a favourable impression. 'I was,' said the king, 'the last to consent to the separation; but, the separation having become inevitable, I have always said, as I say now, that I would be the first to meet the friendship of the United States as an independent power.'

After a short interval the king once more received into the ministry politicians to whom he was personally adverse, and a coalition was formed between Lord North, long his favourite minister, and Mr. Fox, who since the death of Lord Rockingham had been the leader of the opposition. It was urged in favour of this alliance that the American war had previously been the great difficulty, and that the views of these statesmen concurred on many other subjects. But, before entering again upon office, Mr. Fox stipulated that the king should not attempt to direct the counsels of ministers who were the responsible advisers of the crown.¹ The first great undertaking of the new ministry was to make an important change in the administration of British India.

The mercantile company which had established its factories in India and defended them with its troops had become gradually, through the ascendancy of British intellect and military skill, the master of rich provinces, and had opened to the trading classes of Great Britain a new road to wealth and honour. Reports, however, were afloat to the effect that the company had assisted Eastern princes to despoil the helpless natives. Committees of the House of Commons, indeed, had instituted inquiry, and had passed censure on the governor of India, Warren Hastings, and on the chief justice. The question was momentous how far the charters which successive kings had granted to the company justified the English government in conceding to it an extent of power which had been totally unforeseen. The only restraint on the English masters of India had hitherto been their own sense of justice and humanity; and, according to report, these virtues had too frequently been set at nought by avarice. The great subject of the reformation of the Indian government had become Burke's engrossing pursuit. With that object he accumulated stores of knowledge, 'such as certainly were never attained by any public man who had never quitted Europe.'² 'India and its inhabitants were to him a real country and a real people.' With Burke's assistance, Fox now brought forward an important bill, transferring the political authority from the company

¹ Massey, iii. 153. Fox's Correspondence, p. 38.

² See Macaulay's essay 'On Warren Hastings.'

to commissioners. These were to be appointed for four years, but were removable by the king on the advice of Parliament. The bill has been considered admirable in many respects, and decidedly calculated to attain the great aim of its promoters, the extinction of tyranny and oppression. But it was viewed beyond the walls of Parliament not with regard to its philanthropic bearing upon thirty millions of people, but in relation to its interference with existing interests; and the king, ever jealous for his prerogative, was assured that, although it tended to strengthen the power of the ministry, it would diminish that of the crown. In spite of much hostility, it was supported in the House of Commons by a majority of above a hundred, and on December 9 it was carried to the House of Lords in triumph by Fox, attended by a large number of his supporters.

But the royal hand was held out to check its progress. George III., who hated, even when he admitted, the coalition ministry, now determined that this measure should not pass. Having disguised his sentiments till the last moment, the king procured the rejection of the bill by privately announcing to the Lords that he should look upon anyone who supported it as an enemy, and immediately afterwards he dismissed his ministers.¹ A resolution was almost simultaneously passed by a large majority of the House of Commons, that for the sovereign's opinion of any measure before the House to be made known 'in order to influence the members, is a high crime, derogatory to the honour of the crown, a breach of the privileges of Parliament, and subversive of the constitution of this country.' Thus, in a crisis hitherto without example, the ministers were foiled by the sovereign whom they had undertaken to serve. George III. is said to have exercised more personal influence over public affairs than any monarch since Elizabeth.²

William Pitt, second son of that Earl of Chatham whom George III. had so little liked, now became, at the age of twenty-four, the head of a new administration.³ His task was difficult, for although he had the entire confidence of the

¹ See Stanhope's 'Life of William Pitt,' i. 148-149. There was a majority against the bill of nineteen in the Upper House.

² Massey's History, iii. 210. Lord Stanhope calls the king's conduct at this time 'most unusual and most extreme.'—'Life of Pitt,' i. 155.

³ The appointment did not take the nation by surprise. Pitt was a distinguished member of the House of Commons at the age of twenty-one, and had scarcely completed his twenty-third year when he became Chancellor of the Exchequer under Lord Shelburne. According to Macaulay, 'the ability which he had displayed in the House made him the most powerful subject in Europe before he was twenty-five.'

king, the majority of the House of Commons opposed him, and he was defeated in no less than sixteen divisions. The public voice was, however, in his favour. The coalition ministry had not been popular, and when Mr. Pitt went in state to Guildhall to receive the freedom of the city, he met with a hearty reception. The East Indian interest used all their power against those who had so lately assailed their privileges, and the manufacturers of Yorkshire dreaded the free-trade theories of Burke. The hostile majorities gradually declined under court influence, and when, on March 8, a remonstrance to the king, proposed by Fox and supported by Burke, was carried in a full House by a majority of but one, Mr. Pitt was encouraged to dissolve Parliament. It was for the country to decide between the ministry and the opposition, and the country supported Mr. Pitt, and displaced a hundred and fifty of the adherents of the former ministers.

Fox was known as the friend and political ally of the young Prince of Wales, who, although he had some popular qualities, offended the serious part of the nation by his gross extravagance. A cry was raised that it was not only 'Fox against Pitt; but prince against king.' In Westminster, where the election was hotly contested for the forty days over which it at that time extended, the prince wore Fox's colours openly. Pitt became from this time the most powerful minister that England had seen for centuries, and retained the chief direction of affairs for seventeen years.¹ But, although with a much diminished band of followers, Fox was still the leader of a powerful party.

In August, 1784, Pitt succeeded in passing a bill for the future government of British India, which placed the supreme power in the hands of the governor-general and a board of control appointed by the crown, and by this means restrained the power hitherto exercised by the company, a measure drawn with modifications from the bill proposed by Fox. Soon after this time, India again absorbed public attention. It was not that the fate of an administration depended on a proposed measure, as in 1783, but that the voice of humanity was at length heard. Englishmen, it was urged, had trampled cruelly on the subject natives of India, and had exhibited 'the most frightful of all spectacles, the strength of civilisation, without its mercy.'²

Warren Hastings, after twenty-two years spent in India,

¹ Stanhope's 'Pitt,' p. 208.

² Macaulay, essay 'On Warren Hastings.'

became in 1772, through his extraordinary ability and perseverance, the governor of Bengal, and was, in fact, the despotic master of the country. His efforts in improving the revenue and extending the power of the company were uniformly successful; the native princes bent before him and brought him tribute, and he occasionally appeared in public invested with more than ordinary regal splendour. In consequence of an Act passed in 1773, according to which associates were deputed to advise the governor-general, three councillors were sent out from England, one of whom, Philip Francis, became his inveterate opponent.¹ Although the power of Hastings still continued nothing less than despotic, the abuses of that power were now first made known to Europe. It was divulged that, at the instigation of the Nabob of Oude, who promised a large reward, Hastings had lent the invincible English troops to overrun the fertile province of Rohilcund, and to take part in a war with which the English had no concern, and which was pursued with merciless barbarity. It was said that he had received large presents for his interference in the affairs of rival princes, that he had ordered the execution of a Brahmin on a charge of forgery, under fear of that Indian's hostility, and that, in the eager desire for increased revenue, he had allowed the perpetration of gross acts of cruelty. Before the close of the American war, select committees of the House of Commons had investigated the grounds of these charges, and by a majority consisting of widely different political parties, censure was pronounced upon Hastings. Burke, at the head of one committee, and Dundas, who presided over another, recorded their opinions that the Rohilla war was a disgrace to the British arms, and that a governor who had brought so much evil upon the people ought, for the honour of the country, to be recalled. English law had in India been made unbearably oppressive by a tyrannical chief justice, and that judge, Sir Elijah Impey, was recalled. But the directors of the East India Company resolutely refused to dismiss a governor-general by whose talents British India had been so much improved, and had been made to produce so large a revenue.

When, in the year 1780, the invasion of Hyder Ali brought the British possessions in Southern India into great danger, they were rescued by the prompt measures taken by Hastings, and, in gratitude for these great services, the company endeavoured to shield him from the attacks of his accusers. It was

¹ The governor of Bengal was henceforth constituted governor-general of the company's possessions.

pleaded that his past services should be considered an atonement for any errors which he might have committed, and that he had not hoarded so much wealth as would justify the charge of rapacity. In the year 1785, Hastings resigned his office and returned to England, where he was received with much favour both by the king and by the directors. Still, deeply persuaded of the wrongs which had been committed, Burke did not allow himself to be deterred from that prosecution which he had made the great object of his life, and in the next session of Parliament he demanded an inquiry into the official conduct of the ex-governor-general of India. On February 27, 1786, Burke, assisted by the principal leaders of the opposition, began the attack in the House of Commons.

Hastings read a long defence, after which his accusers entered into the details of the charge. When Fox, following Burke, enlarged on the unjustifiable severity of Hastings towards the Rajah of Benares, whom he compelled to pay an enormous fine as a punishment for delaying a large contribution, Pitt withdrew all further opposition to the inquiry. Parliament being prorogued, the proceedings were interrupted, and it was not till the next year, February, 1787, that Sheridan made a speech describing the cruelties which had been inflicted on the aged princesses of Oude, and their servants, which was said to surpass all former oratory heard in Parliament.¹ The House of Commons directed Burke to attend the House of Lords to impeach the late governor-general, who took his place at the bar. The proceedings were again suspended at the close of the session, but in the following winter the House of Commons nominated a committee, headed by Burke, to conduct the impeachment. The time was at hand for which he had so ardently longed. His accumulated stores of knowledge were now availing, and he was able to plead with superior eloquence the cause of injured India before the most free and intelligent tribunal in Europe. But further delays intervening, it was not till February 13, 1788, that the ever-memorable trial commenced.

Then took place the grand parliamentary procession to Westminster Hall, headed by Burke and the other appointed prosecutors in court-dress, followed by members of Parliament, by judges and peers in robes of scarlet and ermine, and by the lord chancellor and the royal princes. The queen and her daughters witnessed the scene from a private compart-

¹ Stanhope's 'Pitt,' i. 328. No correct report was taken of this celebrated speech, for which Sheridan was immediately offered a thousand pounds.

ment. Before this august assembly, in that venerable hall, the man who had exercised despotic rule over vast realms knelt at the bar until desired by the lord chancellor to rise. After two days had been occupied by the reading of official documents, Burke began his address by a general description of India, explaining the origin of the East India Company in the reign of Elizabeth, and the growth of its power; condemning the opinion that the British Legislature could confer irresponsible power on any man, or on any body of men. When, on the third day of an address extending over four, Burke described the tortures said to have been inflicted on the defenceless Hindoos by men under Hastings' protection, many of the audience shed tears. The excitement caused by the trial was for some time intense, and fifty guineas were given for a seat. But when dry details were discussed and the examination of the witnesses proved tedious, the public interest diminished. The delays occasioned by the prorogation of Parliament, and the difficulty of bringing witnesses from so distant a country, protracted the trial beyond ordinary patience. Although, in order to lessen the delay, many articles of impeachment were withdrawn, it was not until 1795, nearly eight years after Hastings had first bent his knee before the House of Lords, that numbers again filled Westminster Hall to listen to the judgment. Only twenty-nine peers then gave their votes; six of these, one of whom was the lord chancellor, found Hastings guilty on the two principal charges; on other charges he was unanimously acquitted. The lord chancellor then informed Hastings that the Lords had acquitted him, and he was solemnly discharged, a decision which was generally expected. His health does not appear to have suffered materially either from the climate of India or from the anxiety attending the long public trial, for he survived till August, 1818, and died in his eighty-sixth year.¹

This trial, although ending in an acquittal, was, says Lord Russell, highly beneficial to the great cause of justice and humanity. 'India was saved, in future, from administrations disgraceful to the English name.' It appeared impossible that acts could be repeated which had received so marked a censure.² In the autumn of the same year in which this great trial commenced, the alarm caused by the king's illness absorbed for a time the thoughts of the nation. The king, who had been in

¹ Macaulay, essay 'On Warren Hastings.'

² Russell's 'Memorials of C. J. Fox,' ii. 247.

weak health for some time, suddenly, in the beginning of November, lost the control of his reason, and his medical advisers felt doubtful of his being able in future to conduct the affairs of state. The difficult question of a regency agitated the public mind. Mr. Fox, so well known as confidential adviser to the Prince of Wales, travelled with the utmost haste from Italy to urge the prince's claim to the throne during the time of his father's incapacity. Being of full age, the prince was the undoubted successor whenever the throne should be vacant, but as his political opinions differed greatly from those of the king, whose health might be very soon restored, it was a delicate question to decide on the transference of the royal authority. The recovery of the king's reason took place sooner than had been expected. In the spring of 1789 he was able to resume his correspondence with his ministers, and on April 23 the king and queen and the royal family, accompanied by Peers and Commons and great officers of state, went in solemn procession to St. Paul's to return thanks for his Majesty's happy recovery. The attachment to the king had latterly increased, and the public sympathy, which was now strongly excited in his favour, displayed itself in the most general illumination which had yet been seen in England.

Events were at this time impending in France through which all Europe became soon afterwards involved in war, and nearly every throne was shaken. The political discontent which had long been increasing in France was stimulated by the French alliance with the free community of America. While in England institutions favourable to the general liberty, which had existed from early times, had been gradually strengthened and secured, the French monarchy had become entirely despotic, and violations of justice took place such as beset every government which is 'not under the constant inspection of a popular representation.' Long wars and court prodigality had involved the state in a load of debt, and the weight of taxation fell chiefly on the 'third estate,' on those unprivileged because not noble. By the advice of his able finance minister, Necker, of Geneva, Louis XVI. allowed the ancient Assembly of France, the States-General, which had not been convoked since 1614, to be summoned, and on May 5, 1789, opened the session in person. An immediate difficulty arose concerning the separation of the three orders—the nobles, clergy, and third estate. If each of these, according to old custom, had a separate hall, the first two chambers would

¹ The words of Burke in his 'Essay on the French Revolution,' p. 127.

prevail over the third. A proposal that the three orders should deliberate together was refused by the higher classes, and when the popular deputies, who called themselves a National Assembly, declared that without their consent taxation was illegal, the court became alarmed and closed their doors. Highly irritated by this proceeding, Bailly, mayor of Paris, the chosen president of the Assembly, led the deputies to the tennis court, where, under great excitement, they pledged themselves not to separate until they had framed a new constitution which should redress the public grievances. Supported by the determined multitude out of doors, this National Assembly, joined by several of the clergy and by some nobles, became in a short time the greatest power in France; and notwithstanding the continuance on their part of a certain professed allegiance towards the king, the royal authority henceforth lost all its vigour. A report of the dismissal of Necker, the popular minister, excited the Parisians to insurrection. On July 14 they attacked the fortress-prison called the Bastille, in which for centuries it had been usual to confine political prisoners, who were unredeemed by any 'act of habeas corpus,' and who frequently perished untried, sometimes even forgotten. The prisoners were rescued from the Bastille, but the life of the governor was sacrificed in his attempt to defend it. 'Insurrection,' says Carlyle, 'if ever necessary, is a most sad necessity. One of its worst evils is that of irritating and exasperating men against each other. Violence does even justice unjustly.'¹ On August 4 the Assembly passed a decree abolishing all exclusive privileges, declaring that taxation should be levied equally on all Frenchmen, and all citizens be capable of admittance to public employments. The 'Te Deum' was solemnly performed in gratitude for these social victories. 'England,' as Burke wrote at this time, 'was gazing with astonishment at a French struggle for liberty, not knowing whether to blame or to applaud.'² Unhappily, the attacks which were made in various parts of France on the castles of the nobility drove numbers of the higher rank out of the country, and the king was left defenceless. There was remissness in paying the troops, and many regiments became insubordinate. Scarcity of provisions increased the turbulence of the people. On October 6 a lawless mob attacked the royal palace at Versailles, murdered the guards, and compelled the king and queen to remove to Paris. Disgusted by these atrocities,

¹ Carlyle's 'Past and Present,' p. 21.

² Burke wrote thus on August 9, 1789.

Burke published, the next year, 'Reflections on the French Revolution,' an eloquent but vain attempt to moderate the leaders of both parties.¹ But although Burke dreaded the cruelties inflicted by a furious mob more than a return to monarchical tyranny, English lovers of freedom were long 'the dupes of their own hopes,' and confidently trusted that order and good government would soon be established in France. The poet Wordsworth has feelingly recorded the enthusiastic joy with which the beginning of political liberty in France was hailed by many excellent men who were at first ready to overlook the excesses of an uneducated people.² But it was not long before hostile parties were formed in England; those who expressed hopes favourable to the Revolution were stigmatised as the enemies of order, and the cry of 'Church and State' was raised by men who were as ready to violate the law by attacking the friends of liberty as was the mob of Paris to assail and injure the supporters of the monarchy.

Dr. Priestley, of Birmingham, a Dissenting minister of high character, eminent also as a man of science, was known to have sympathised with the cause of liberty in France. Party feeling ran high in that town, and when, in July, 1791, some of his friends proposed to celebrate the second anniversary of the destruction of the Bastille by a public dinner, a riot broke out resembling the terrible disturbances originating ten years before in the fanaticism of Lord George Gordon. The houses of Dr. Priestley and several of his friends were attacked, and his chapel, library, and philosophical apparatus were destroyed. All the gentlemen whose property was thus injured had been distinguished benefactors to Birmingham; but their virtues were utterly disregarded by the unreasoning mob, which shouted 'No Philosophers!' 'Church and King for ever!' Just before the outbreak at Birmingham, the King of France, in disguise, with the queen and royal family, made an unsuccessful attempt to fly the country, but this irritated the nation, and he was from that time really a public prisoner. The worst events which followed at Paris were occasioned by the rash conduct of the king's brothers, who, fixing themselves on the German frontier, allured the sovereigns of Europe to declare war against France.

It was utterly vain that the hapless king, in the hope of

¹ Burke's work was translated into French, and he received a message of thanks from the unfortunate queen.

² See Wordsworth's lines 'On the French Revolution,' Poems, vol. ii. 168, and also 'The Prelude.'

present safety, accepted 'the Constitution' offered him, and was, in the spring of 1792, even induced to advise the Assembly to declare war against the Emperor to whom he was so nearly allied. When, on July 27, 'an atrocious manifesto' was published by the Duke of Brunswick, the generalissimo of the forces which were to invade the northern frontier—a manifesto threatening the French people, in case of personal injury to the king and royal family, with military execution; and, further, warning the inhabitants of every town or village that they would be treated as rebels, if they opposed the invasion—a manifesto said to have been composed by French emigrants on the border—the irritation at Paris became so extreme against those Frenchmen thus capable of betraying their country, that every man who passed for 'an aristocrat' was in instant danger of destruction.¹

After this time there was no hope for the monarchy. The Marquis de la Fayette, who had tried at the hazard of his life to defend the royal family, finding all his expostulations fruitless, left his military post in August, 1792, with a few friends, hoping to escape through Holland and take refuge in America. But he fell into the hands of the Austrians, and remained for five years a prisoner. The revolutionary enthusiasm of his previous years outweighed in their eyes his honourable exertions in favour of Marie Antoinette and her family, at the time of their greatest necessity.²

The French Republicans repelled the invaders with invincible bravery. Before the end of September, the Prussians retired beyond the frontiers, and in November, the French gained a complete victory over the Austrians at Jemmapes; Dumouriez entered Brussels in triumph, and the greater part of Belgium was subdued.³ When, in August, 1792, all authority was taken from the King of France, the British ambassador was recalled; but, till late in the autumn, Mr. Pitt, then prime minister, hoped to preserve England from war, judging it most wise to leave France to arrange its own internal affairs.⁴ The present rulers of France were, however, not satisfied with dethroning their own sovereign; they declared war against the

¹ See Carlyle's 'French Revolution,' and Thiers, vol. i. The Duke of Brunswick is said to have signed with reluctance the proclamation which thus disgraced his name.

² See Stanhope's 'Life of Pitt,' ii. 166. La Fayette was confined at Olmütz, and did not return to France till 1799.

³ When Louis Philippe was on the throne of France, he liked to recur to the victory of Jemmapes, in which he, the son of the Duke of Orleans, who took the Republican side, had taken part.

⁴ Stanhope, ii. 174.

kings of Europe, and on November 19 issued a decree offering assistance to all who desired to rebel against their constituted authorities—a document which they ordered to be translated and widely circulated. The French ambassador still remained in London, but when, after the cruel mockery of a public trial, the unhappy King of France was, by a small majority, condemned to death, and suffered on January 21, George III. promptly issued an order in council for the ambassador's departure. On the very same day, M. Chauvelin was recalled by the French government, which, on February 1, declared war with England and Holland.

It was with great satisfaction and hope that George III. saw his second son, the Duke of York, who had been educated to the military profession, placed in command of the British troops which were sent in the spring of 1793 to join the Austrians in Belgium. But, although the allies obtained at first some success, they were far inferior in strength to the French, who fought in defence of their country and of their newly acquired rights with the utmost energy. Attacked on all sides, the armies of France proved everywhere victorious. Spain was compelled to sue for peace, the Sardinians were driven from the passes of the Alps, and in Flanders the failures of the allied arms obliged Mr. Pitt, the next year, to advise the recall of the Duke of York, which was a great mortification to the king. Prussia endeavoured to arrange a separate peace, and, in the beginning of 1795, Holland was conquered by the French, and the Prince of Orange took refuge in England. At Paris a series of atrocities had disgraced the name of liberty. The late queen, Marie Antoinette, was executed in October, 1793, under peculiarly revolting circumstances. Philippe, Duke of Orleans, too, who had disgraced himself by voting for the execution of Louis XVI., underwent the same fate. The 'Reign of Terror' ceased with the death of Robespierre, leader of the extreme revolutionists, who, on July 27, 1794, was himself at length drawn to the guillotine. The horror which was aroused in England by the cruelties perpetrated in France had led to suspicion of the influence of reformers and of all who sympathised with democracy. In May, 1792, a royal proclamation warned the people against seditious writings, and, towards the end of that year, public meetings were held in London, influenced by men of property, to declare attachment to the British Constitution and hostility to revolutionary principles.¹ The Habeas Corpus Act,

¹ Stanhope's 'Life of Pitt,' ii. 178.

according to which no person can be imprisoned on suspicion without a definite charge against him, and which compels a speedy trial, was several times suspended. The revolutionary spirit had been most prominent in Scotland, and was there severely repressed. Old Scottish laws against sedition were again brought forward, and Thomas Muir, a barrister, and the Rev. Fysche Palmer, of Dundee, both men of respectable character, but who had been imprudent in uttering their opinions, were convicted of sedition, and 'sent to herd with felons' at the newly formed convict settlement at Botany Bay.¹ According to impartial writers, in these cases the law was strained and witnesses were held back who would have spoken for the defence.

Two societies had been formed in London to promote the reform of Parliament, called 'the Corresponding Society' and the 'Society for Promoting Constitutional Information,' and at their meetings some of the members had used intemperate language.

Early in May, 1794, eight members of these two London societies were examined before the Privy Council and sent to the Tower on a charge of high treason. The foremost of these were Thomas Hardy, a shoemaker by trade, Horne Tooke, formerly a clergyman, now a writer of repute, and the Rev. Jeremiah Joyce, private secretary to Lord Stanhope and tutor to his sons. Five more persons were afterwards included in the same indictment, one of whom was Thomas Holcroft, a popular author. Hardy's memorable trial began on October 28, before a special jury, consisting of men of that class in society most strongly pledged to the maintenance of order. The speech of Sir John Scott, the attorney-general, who opened the case, lasted nine hours.² Before this time, there had been scarcely an instance in England of a trial for high treason lasting more than one day, but in this case midnight had arrived before much progress had been made in the examination of the witnesses for the prosecution. It was not till the eighth day, after the seven hours' speech of the eloquent Erskine in defence had been followed by an address of ten hours from the solicitor-general, that the jury, after a three hours' consultation, brought in a verdict of 'Not Guilty.' The drift of Erskine's argument was to show that the charge of high

¹ See Lord Macaulay's 'Biography of Pitt,' and Stanhope, ii. 213, for observations condemning the injustice of these Scottish trials. Botany Bay was the first of the convict settlements in Australia.

² Stanhope's 'Pitt,' ii. 267. Sir John was afterwards Lord Chancellor Eldon.

treason, involving tremendous penalties, required the most exact proof. To conspire against the king's lawful authority—supposing the existence of a conspiracy—was a crime of great magnitude and liable to severe punishment, but was not the particular crime now alleged, the threatening the life and safety of the sovereign. Witnesses of high rank were summoned who bore testimony to the peaceable character of Hardy, and it was satisfactory to find that a man of his station was treated on the trial with respect and impartiality. Although defeated in this first trial, the government proceeded to arraign John Horne Tooke on the same charge, supported by nearly the same evidence, when, after another able defence by Erskine, the verdict was the same as before. A third trial, that of Thelwall, followed, with the same result; thus, disastrously for the government, ended the prosecutions for high treason. The people of London were of a very different temper from those rioters of Birmingham who, three years before, had assailed Dr. Priestley's house, amidst cries of 'Church and King!' Bonfires and blazing torches, signs of rejoicing, illuminated the streets, and Erskine was drawn in triumph on the evening of the last day of the trial to his house in Serjeants' Inn. The verdict brought in by the jury at this time of excitement has been called 'a lasting benefit to mankind.' It convinced Englishmen of the worth of their institutions, that the force of a powerful government, backed by an alarmed and fierce aristocracy, 'had not prevented the course of the trial from being calm and just.'¹ There was no brow-beating of witnesses, no danger to the jurymen, as there would have been in the time of Judge Jeffreys. The orators and pamphleteers arraigned must have perceived that, although far from high treason, they had come near to breaking the law, and that the reign of law in England was equally unlike the despotism of the old French monarchy and the tyranny of demagogues which had succeeded it.

But although sympathy with republican government was declining in England, in Ireland it was increasing, and Ireland had real grievances. In the year 1791 a new combination under the influence of French example had been formed in that island, calling itself 'the Society of United Irishmen;' and although in some instances sedition followed, Mr. Pitt felt that the restrictions oppressing the Irish Roman Catholics were a natural cause of discontent, and that those restrictions

¹ See an article on the 'Life of Lord Eldon,' in 'Westminster Review' of December, 1844, attributed to Mr. Roebuck.

ought to be removed. Burke, although the eloquent adversary of the revolutionary party, gave his best assistance to the cause of his oppressed countrymen.¹

A bill was accordingly passed, early in 1793, repealing the most obnoxious of those restrictions. It repealed all the penalties and disabilities affecting the education of children, and the inheritance of property; admitted the Roman Catholics to vote at elections, and enabled them, for the first time for a hundred years, to hold civil or military offices. The bill did not pass without strong opposition from the late ruling party in Ireland. 'It was more easy to abolish the penal laws than to root out the feelings and tendencies which they had produced.' The defects and abuses existing in Ireland in both Church and State affairs could not be suddenly eradicated.² With the desire of conciliating the more intelligent Irish malcontents it was determined that Earl Fitzwilliam should be lord-lieutenant, and he arrived in Dublin in January, 1794. The appointment of a nobleman favourable to the Liberal cause immediately excited the strongest hopes among those who held themselves aggrieved by the English law. He received addresses from Roman Catholics and Protestant Dissenters upon his arrival, to which he returned encouraging replies.

Petitions for complete Catholic emancipation now poured into the Irish House of Commons from every county, with altogether more than half a million of signatures. Pitt himself desired that emancipation as a measure of justice, but wished it deferred to quieter times. The main Protestant party in Ireland was opposed to it, as was also King George III., who had taken up the idea that he was withheld from consenting to further indulgence of the Roman Catholics by his coronation oath. Meanwhile two official personages of high rank, who had been dismissed by the lord-lieutenant, carried their complaints to London, upon which Pitt thought right to remonstrate with the lord-lieutenant, and Lord Fitzwilliam in consequence resigned.

Deep gloom overcast Dublin on the day when the most popular governor ever sent out departed from Ireland. The hopes just raised were as suddenly blighted. The shops were shut, the greater part of the citizens dressed themselves in mourning, and respectable townsmen drew the carriage of the

¹ Stanhope's 'Pitt,' ii. 275.

² Ib. 280. It was declared by the Duke of Norfolk, a Protestant, that in many districts of the south of Ireland a Protestant clergyman thought himself fortunate if he had a good living, *without* the trouble of a congregation.

beloved nobleman to the water side. When also, shortly afterwards, Lord Camden was installed as lord-lieutenant, a gloomy silence prevailed, and a formidable riot assailed those who were believed by the populace to have been the late viceroy's political enemies. Party feeling rose higher than ever. The Society of United Irishmen became more sympathetic with France and more secret in their councils, and they were opposed by another mischievous association which, perverting the favourite badge of William III., called themselves 'the Orange Society,' the avowed object of which was the subjugation of the Romanists.

On April 8, in the same year, the Prince of Wales, afterwards George IV., was married to his cousin, the Princess Caroline of Brunswick. It was a marriage contracted for reasons of state policy, and devoid of affection. Less than a year afterwards, soon after the birth of a princess, the prince announced that he should live no longer with his wife, and the Princess of Wales removed, with her infant, the Princess Charlotte Augusta, to another residence.¹

The close of the memorable trial of Warren Hastings has been already mentioned as occurring in April, 1795. From the commencement of that great trial the public mind had been chiefly occupied by the French Revolution and the war with France ; even Burke, Hastings's energetic accuser, was devoting his last years to arrest the evil tendencies of revolutionary 'Jacobinism.'² Hastings was so fortunate as to regain possession of the family estate at Daylesford, in Worcestershire, where he chiefly spent the remaining twenty-four years of his life, devoting large sums to its embellishment. An annuity of £4,000, settled on him by the East India Company, might have amply provided for the declining years of a governor-general, but Hastings's position had made him profuse in expenditure. Nor did he remain long unnoticed. When, in 1813, the charter of the company required renewal, the House of Commons requested his presence, and received him with respect, rising and uncovering as he retired. He received similar acknowledgment from the House of Lords ; and the University of Oxford conferred upon him the degree of Doctor of Laws. He was also admitted to the privy council, and when, in 1814, the crowned heads visited England, Hastings

¹ The king had approved the marriage and continued to show kindness to his daughter-in-law.

² Burke, after his retirement from Parliament in 1794, wrote strongly against concluding peace with the French regicides. He died at Beaconsfield in July, 1797.

appeared among the assembled princes and warriors, meeting everywhere with the recognition due to his former position.

During the first years of the revolutionary war, there appeared to be scarcely any power in Europe able to withstand French domination. England was compelled to do her work nearly alone, and looked out anxiously for allies. The inhabitants of the southern provinces of France, devout Roman Catholics, obstinately contested the sovereignty of the French Republic. Even Toulon, in 1793, implored the help of a British fleet, but was besieged and taken by the Republicans. It was in the siege of Toulon that Napoleon Bonaparte first distinguished himself. Notwithstanding previous failures, Pitt was apprised in 1794 that the Royalists of Brittany were ready to rise if assured of English assistance, and Count Joseph de Puisaye came to London to urge the government on behalf of his cause. The scattered bands of Brittany, which included many outlaws and marauders, could not resist the power of the government, unless sustained by England. But Pitt eagerly entered into the scheme, several bodies of French emigrants were enlisted, and ten thousand guineas were provided in coin. The promoters of the intended enterprise hoped that one of the Bourbon princes might be the leader.

The Comte d'Artois (afterwards Charles X.) did not refuse to head the enterprise as requested, but, distrustful of its success, perhaps also apprehensive as to his fate in case of failure, was reluctant decisively to commit himself. 'The year Ninety-five' of France, says Lord Stanhope, can never be ranked with the 'Forty-five' of Scotland, notwithstanding the equal devotion in both cases of the adherents to their sovereigns.¹ The invasion of a country is always full of peril, and justly excites the strongest indignation in its inhabitants. At first success was not hopeless; the English fleet succeeded in capturing two French men-of-war, and on June 27 the emigrant chiefs and their soldiers landed within Quiberon bay, near the Druid stones of Carnac, where 10,000 men were soon collected. But while the officers deliberated and disagreed, General Hoche, the Republican commander, assembled a sufficient force for their expulsion, and the emigrant troops, with scanty supplies, were driven into the narrow peninsula of Quiberon. A second squadron which arrived from England with 11,000 men was inadequate to oppose the advance of their formidable adversaries, and a cruel fate awaited some of the bravest and noblest

¹ 'Life of Pitt,' ii. 316.

of the old aristocracy of France. Pressed together on the desolate beach of Quibéron, between the rolling sea, which prevented the English vessels from approaching them, and the pitiless foes in front, many officers are said to have insured a quicker mode of death by the use of their own swords. M. de Puisaye and some others were so fortunate as to reach the English ships; about a thousand emigrants laid down their arms in the hope of pardon, but the greater part were put to death, according to one of the most sanguinary decrees of the Reign of Terror, which pronounced that every emigrant taken with arms in his hands should be executed without trial.¹

At this juncture died the unfortunate child of the deceased king, to whom the Royalists gave the title of Louis XVII., from the effects of ill-usage and cruel neglect on the part of his keepers in Paris. After this time the eldest remaining brother of Louis XVI., called Monsieur, who had lately resided at Verona, became the titular King of France—an empty title for the next nineteen years. When the vessels bringing back the wretched survivors of the Quibéron expedition took shelter in the islet of Houat they were at length joined by the Comte d'Artois, who took possession of Belleisle, where he remained for six weeks. Unable to effect anything decisive, he ultimately returned to England, much to the disappointment of the officers who had engaged in his cause.

France and England suffered this year great distress from the dearth of corn. The war had laid waste great parts of the corn districts on the Vistula and Rhine, and the harvest had proved scanty throughout Europe. In England severe distress provoked dangerous riots. Increasing scarcity and still increasing taxation naturally caused discontent, and a strong feeling was manifested against the continuance of the war. Why should England alone waste her blood and treasure in the vain hope of imposing a change of government on a neighbouring nation?

The government of France had in 1795 undergone an entire change. Two chambers were instituted in the place of the Convention, and the executive power was intrusted to a Council of five Directors, who took up their residence in the Luxembourg palace. The new chiefs were not sanguinary tyrants, and the friends of peace in England thought that it

¹ Stanhope, ii. 344. Hoche endeavoured to obtain mercy from the Convention, declaring that his soldiers were weary of acting as executioners. The escape of many prisoners was connived at, but about seven hundred are said to have perished.

would be wiser to enter into amicable relations with them than to continue the war in hopes of restoring the monarchy which France had abjured.¹ Although no success had been obtained on the continent, the year 1794 did not pass without some victories. Corsica, a prey to dissensions, had risen against the French government. Bastia, the capital of the island, held by the French, was taken by Lord Hood and Captain Nelson, and the Corsicans expressed their desire that the island should be annexed to England with a separate free constitution. Another naval victory was soon afterwards achieved by Lord Howe over the French armament then cruising in the British Channel to protect an expected convoy from America. One of the French 'seventy-fours' went down in the action, with many hundred men on board, five ships were taken by the English and brought home in triumph by Lord Howe. The popular rejoicings over this victory at this time of depression were exuberant. London was illuminated for three successive nights; the king and queen and some of the princesses visited the fleet at Spithead; and a sword enriched with diamonds was presented to Lord Howe.

But the English ascendancy in Corsica did not last more than two years. The Corsicans soon became proud of their young countryman Bonaparte, who was gaining brilliant victories in Italy, and in October, 1796, the British troops were withdrawn, and the island restored to the rule of France. During that year the only successes gained over the French were in the West Indies. Burke, indeed, deploring though still justifying the war, observed that 'disastrous events followed one another in a long unbroken funereal train that seemed to have no end.'² There is no doubt, says Lord Stanhope, that Pitt was now earnestly intent on concluding peace. He had seen at Quibéron the best blood of France shed in vain for a cause which appeared utterly hopeless, and the increasing strain of the war on the finances and commerce of England was hard to bear. 'How were further imposts to be imposed on a people already staggering under the heavy burdens of war,' aggravated by the famine price of corn? The difficulty of raising funds fell doubly upon England, for without British

¹ Wilberforce, although one of Pitt's personal adherents, at the close of 1794 moved an amendment to the Address, praying that endeavours should be made to bring about peace. He was joined by a few other supporters of the government, but the king resented all attempts to conclude the war. See Stanhope's 'Pitt,' ii. 295 and 366.

² Stanhope's 'Pitt,' ii. 380. Two 'Letters on a Regicide Peace' were published by Burke in 1796; others on the same subject after his death.

aid the court of Vienna pleaded inability to maintain the arduous contest in Germany and Italy, upon which Pitt consented to send them the sum of £1,200,000, which he knew the House of Commons would afterwards sanction. That House was indeed uniformly subservient to his wishes. When, in May, 1696, Fox moved an address to the crown against the continuance of the war, he could muster only 42 votes against 216.¹

In 1796 some experiments in steam navigation were sanctioned by the Lords of the Admiralty. Lord Stanhope, a nobleman of great scientific ingenuity, earnestly supported a plan 'of navigating ships of the largest size even against wind and waves,' which, as he truly said, was a 'subject of far more importance' than the Board judged it to be. The report, however, being against its practicability, it was abandoned.²

After the attempted invasion of France on the coast of Brittany, little surprise could be felt that the French should retaliate by planning an invasion of Ireland, in league with Irish malcontents. Preparations for that purpose chiefly occupied the attention of General Hoche during the autumn of 1796. On December 15 a considerable armament left the French coast to effect a landing at Bantry Bay; but the ships were scattered by heavy gales, and the expedition proved a total failure, as likewise another attempt in the following February, on the coast of Pembrokeshire. There, indeed, the invaders landed and began to plunder, but the volunteers and militia, stoutly aided by the country people, who seized on their implements of husbandry to defend their country, soon compelled them to surrender as prisoners of war. The invasion of England was, in fact, for some years a favourite scheme in France, and in this operation the fleets of Spain and Holland were designed to co-operate with the French fleet at Brest. But a victory won by Sir John Jervis, with the powerful aid of Commodore Nelson and Captain Collingwood, over the Spanish fleet off Cadiz in the same month 'came as a speck of blue amidst dark clouds,' and the victors were rewarded, Jervis by the title of Earl St. Vincent, and Nelson by knighthood.³

That cheering 'speck of blue' was soon, however, succeeded by still greater gloom. England's darkest hour was in the spring of 1797. A commercial panic and scarcity of money emptied the coffers of the Bank of England at the very time that a most extensive and dangerous mutiny occurred in the

¹ Stanhope, ii. 373. 'The king was extremely adverse' to peace.

² Ib. ii. 397.

³ Stanhope's 'Pitt,' iii. 12.

fleet. The finances had been drained for the support of those foreign allies who were now ranging themselves upon the side of victorious France. Large sums were wanted for the protection of Ireland, and, under the immediate alarm of a French invasion, numbers withdrew their money from the country banks, which in turn pressed upon the Bank of England. It had been hitherto the rule to pay gold for bank-notes on demand, but this was then found to be no longer possible. By an order of the council, which was assembled by Pitt on February 26, cash payments were stopped at the bank, an order which was confirmed next day by Parliament.¹

The discontent of the seamen, which first roused them to mutiny, appears to have been partly justified. Their pay was still the same as in the reign of Charles II., although provisions had risen in price at least 30 per cent., and complaints were made of harshness and tyranny on the part of some of the officers. The first mutiny at Portsmouth had just been with some difficulty appeased, when a more formidable revolt occurred at Sheerness. This was tainted by the political spirit of the times, and was conducted by Richard Parker, a man of great boldness, who assumed the title of rear-admiral. After taking possession of Sheerness, the mutineers moved their ships to the Nore, and proceeded to blockade the mouth of the Thames. To guard against danger, troops were summoned in haste to London, and the banks of the Thames lined with detachments. In spite of this revolt, the mutineers showed a loyal spirit, for on the king's birthday, June 4, the colours were hoisted on every one of their ships except the 'Sandwich,' over which Parker presided.

Bills passed rapidly through Parliament for inflicting severe punishment on any persons who should excite sedition among men in the king's service, and prohibiting all intercourse with the mutineers. The sailors who were stationed at Plymouth and Spithead exhorted the mutineers to return to their duty, calling their conduct 'a scandal to the name of British seamen.'

The sense of shame, and the privations of interrupted communication with the shore, at length subdued the spirit of revolt, and one by one all the ships except the 'Sandwich' hauled down the red flag of sedition.

¹ So great was the emergency that Pitt induced the king to hold a council on Sunday, the 26th. It was apprehended by the leaders of the opposition that notes which could not be converted into gold would soon fall into discredit. But, happily, the credit of England was sustained and cash payments were not resumed till the year 1819.

Parker was arrested, tried by court-martial, and hanged at the yard-arm of his own ship. Some other ringleaders were also executed or severely punished, but the greater part of the men returned to their duty, and by their bravery redeemed their character in an engagement fought under Lord Duncan, in the following October, with the Dutch.¹

A public thanksgiving was ordered to celebrate the three naval victories obtained by Lords Howe, St. Vincent, and Duncan, over the French and their allies, the Spaniards and the Dutch. On December 19 a special service was held at St. Paul's, attended by the king, queen, and royal family.

But, while England rejoiced, Ireland was pervaded by civil war and turbulent discontent. Although the expedition planned by Hoche had failed, the communication between the French Republicans and the Irish leaders was uninterrupted. In an evil hour the Irish government confided the security of the country to the 37,000 Protestant yeomanry, who wore the Orange ribbon as their badge.² After a proclamation of martial law the unfortunate peasants were in many parts of Ireland driven by persecution into a league of rebellion. The general election of 1797 gave the government a large majority in the Parliament then meeting in Dublin, but still 'the hostile colours, green and orange, stood as before in fierce array against each other;' meetings often resulted in bloody strife.³ In imitation of the French, to whose support they looked, the confederacy of the United Irishmen obeyed the guidance of a secret directory of five persons, one of whom was a Protestant of high rank, Lord Edward Fitzgerald, a son of the Duke of Leinster, who had entered the army early in life, and had afterwards imbibed at Paris, in 1792, the doctrines of the French Republicans. Frank and cordial in manners, Lord Edward was warmly beloved by his countrymen, and his memory has been held in regretful respect by many who are forced to condemn his imprudence. Great vigour was shown by the government in seizing seditious papers and arresting revolutionary agents. The violence of the United Irishmen called necessarily for strong measures of repression, but too often at this period acts of violence were also committed 'by the yeomanry and soldiers against the peasants.' Thus, at the beginning of 1798, the state of Ireland foreshadowed the coming storm. Loyalists on one side, conspirators on the other, were daily growing more

¹ The battle of Camperdown. Stanhope's 'Pitt,' iii. 72.

² Massey's 'History of George III.'s Reign,' iv. 301.

³ Stanhope, iii. 102.

embittered. Still one Irish nobleman, who was also an English peer, the Earl of Moira, ventured repeatedly to urge measures of conciliation, maintaining that the discontents were the effect of unwise severities and 'disgusting tyranny,' and that if Ireland were but made equal with England, she would loyally repel all the efforts of France to invade her shores.¹ But in the awful crisis of an impending invasion, the time for conciliation appeared to have passed away, and the first step towards tranquillising Ireland was necessarily to crush rebellion. A delegate from the Irish confederacy, named Arthur O'Connor, accompanied by a Roman Catholic priest and some subordinates, was arrested on his way to France and brought to Maidstone for trial. That trial, which took place in May, caused great excitement. Fox, Sheridan, Lord John Russell, the Duke of Norfolk, and others of rank, gave evidence favourable to O'Connor's character. He was acquitted, but detained for some months in prison on another warrant. The priest O'Coighly was executed for high treason.

In the months of May and June the long-smouldering flames burst forth in Ireland into open insurrection in all the provinces except Connaught, where leaders were wanting, but which was the scene of havoc and revenge. Everywhere fierce outbreaks were followed by severe repression. Many cottages were burned to the ground, and 'military licence without law stood forth in all its naked deformity.'² Lord Edward Fitzgerald, after trying in vain to secrete himself, was arrested; in a struggle for self-defence he was wounded severely, and he died in prison.

A change in the viceroyalty was now necessary, and the arduous post was accepted by the Marquis Cornwallis, who had ruled India with success, but who now vainly endeavoured in Ireland to restrain the ferocity of party feeling. After all chance of a successful insurrection was over, bands of deluded wretches wandered among the bogs and mountains, committing acts of great cruelty, and were put down by the soldiery without mercy. Meanwhile, Lord Cornwallis continually complained that his plans for the restoration of order were thwarted by the principal persons of the country and also by the members of the Irish Parliament, who were averse to all acts of clemency. 'The words *Papists* and *Priests*,' said he, 'are for ever in their mouths, and by their unaccountable policy they would drive four-fifths of the community into irreconcilable-

¹ Stanhope's 'Pitt,' iii. 108-110.

² Stanhope, iii. 117.

able rebellion.’¹ The French invasion, so eagerly desired by the Irish rebels, was deferred till the last week of August, when General Humbert, accompanied by three Irish exiles, landed at Killala, in the county of Mayo. The attempt only increased the sufferings of the Irish peasantry, about four hundred of whom were killed in action, when Lord Cornwallis headed the regular troops against the invaders, and 180 were afterwards executed by order of a court-martial.

The French arms which the misguided patriots of Ireland believed were destined for their aid had been originally provided for the invasion of Egypt. This hazardous enterprise was undertaken by the French Directory, as was supposed, to form a colony in Africa, and to excite the people in the East against the English. General Bonaparte, who had lately returned to Paris after his successes in Italy, was appointed commander-in-chief of the expedition; 30,000 chosen troops were equipped, and the principal artists and men of science in France prepared to avail themselves of the opportunity. The armament set sail from Toulon on May 14. The island of Malta became an easy conquest, and Bonaparte landed near Alexandria on July 1, speedily overcoming all resistance both on his landing and in his progress to Cairo. That progress was, however, difficult and distressing to the French, who were obliged to cross a vast plain of burning sand, unrelieved by shade or water, under a scorching sun. The victory gained over the Mamelukes, within sight of the Pyramids, was announced to the distant regions of Asia by the caravans travelling to Mecca, and Bonaparte was called in Eastern phraseology ‘the Sultan of Fire.’²

The departure of the French fleet from Toulon was known to Nelson some weeks before he could discover its destination. Guessing that Egypt might be its object, and outsailing the enemy, he was off Alexandria on June 28, but returning, after a cruise to Sicily and Greece, he at last with joy beheld the French tricolour flying from the walls, and immediately attacked the fleet which had anchored in Aboukir Bay. The great naval battle of the Nile, or, as the French call it, of Aboukir, which ended in a complete victory for the English, was fought on both sides with great intrepidity. Nelson lost an eye, and the French admiral was mortally wounded. Only two of the thirteen French ships of the line escaped destruction or capture, and the finest army of France was cut off from its

¹ Lord Cornwallis to the Duke of Portland, July 8, 1798. Stanhope’s ‘Pitt,’ iii. 147.

² Alison’s ‘History of Europe,’ vi. 265.

native country. Turks and Egyptians lined the shore during the conflict, which lasted from sunset till the following morning, beholding with terror the destruction which the two greatest powers of Europe inflicted upon each other. Nelson at the same time apprised the British government and the governor of Bombay that the French invasion of Egypt, which was interpreted as the forerunner of an invasion of India, had thus received an important check.¹

In no way is modern improvement more striking than in the transmission of important news. Vague reports alone at first reached England, where the public anxiety was great, and it was not till October 2 that the joyful intelligence was made known in London. This was accounted the greatest naval victory which the English had ever gained, the greatest defeat experienced by the French since their Revolution. Nelson was immediately ennobled by the title of 'Baron Nelson of the Nile,' with a pension of £2,000 per annum; and congratulations poured in from Russia, Turkey, and Sardinia, then the only powers independent of France.

The naval victory in the East was not, however, followed by success in Europe. Early in 1799, the English government, in alliance with the Emperor of Russia, prepared an expedition to rescue Holland from French dominion, and the allied army of 30,000 men, which was placed under the command of the Duke of York, landed at the mouth of the Texel in the month of September. But the Dutch were unwilling to rise, and this campaign, on which large sums had been expended, and concerning which the king had expressed confident hopes in his speech at the opening of Parliament, proved an inglorious failure.²

The situation of the French army in Egypt after the destruction of their fleet, tasked all the powers of their general. Unable to procure supplies from France, Bonaparte established flour-mills, foundries, and a manufactory of gunpowder. He led his troops into Syria, and besieged Acre, in which the Pasha of Syria had taken refuge. Had this officer relied on his own forces alone, he must have yielded, but he was aided by the skill and bravery of English seamen, commanded by Sir Sidney Smith. Wearied by the continued resistance they thus experienced, the French broke up their camp and returned to Egypt; but when the Turks, emboldened by this success, col-

¹ Massey, iv. 419.

² Stanhope's 'Pitt,' iii. 200. The king's speech was on this occasion delivered on September 24.

lected an army to act against the invaders, they experienced a signal and bloody defeat at Aboukir.

The battle of the Nile, almost entirely destroying the French fleet, had deprived Bonaparte for some time of all intelligence concerning the progress of affairs in Europe. At length, in June, 1799, he received through the English a packet of newspapers, when he found to his dismay that the greater part of Italy, which he had either subdued or humiliated in his victorious campaign of 1797, was, owing to an alliance between Austria and Russia, about to fall under the rule of its former masters.¹ Bonaparte then determined immediately to return to Europe; but it was necessary to use both secrecy and despatch. He had desired the French admiral to keep his two remaining frigates ready for sea, and, leaving the command of the French army in Egypt to General Kléber, he embarked on the night of August 22, accompanied by a few devoted followers. The voyage was long and perilous, both from rough weather and from the nearness of the British fleet, but at length, on the forty-fifth day, he arrived off Fréjus in Provence, where the people, delighted to hail their victorious general, rushed forth to carry him in triumph ashore. He returned to infuse new life into the councils and armies of France.

At this time Pitt was in the deepest anxiety. The Cabinet was divided on the question of prolonging the war, the cause of the continued dearth of provisions. In some parts of England disturbances ensued, and distress was universal. The torrents of rain which fell at the commencement of the harvest of 1800 raised wheat to the famine-price of 120 shillings a quarter.²

Taxation, imperatively necessary for the demands of the war, had been strained to the utmost. Loyalty had also opened the purses of successful merchants. At the beginning of the year 1798, it was suggested by the Speaker that there were in this country many persons of opulence who would readily contribute beyond the measure of taxation to the exigencies of the state. The experiment was tried, and proved very successful. Free gifts, which might have been truly called by the abused term of *Benevolences*, were eagerly poured in by merchants and tradesmen of London in sums varying from one guinea to £3,000. Mr. Robert Peel, the father of the late celebrated statesman, a rich manufacturer of Lancashire, gave

¹ Stanhope's 'Pitt,' iii. 194.

² Ib. 244. Mr. Pitt declared to his friends that for these 'evils and growing dangers' he could see no adequate remedy.

£10,000. The city of London subscribed £10,000, and the Bank of England £200,000. It is said that these free-will offerings, besides the large sum which came from India, amounted to £2,000,000 sterling.¹ But even such supplies appeared unavailing when England was disbursing money to excite foreign powers to a persevering opposition to France, and could be of no avail against the scarcity of corn. Attempts were made to check all persons from eating more bread than was requisite for health, and a law was passed to prohibit bakers from selling bread till after it had been baked twenty-four hours. An Act called 'the Brown Bread Bill,' which was passed in haste, was found so oppressive and obnoxious that it was repealed at the beginning of the next session of Parliament.²

The continued increase of distress strengthened the desire for peace, particularly as all the efforts of England appeared unavailing to withstand the victorious ascendancy of the French. Increased taxes had been laid on tea, sugar, and spirits, on houses, sales by auction, stage coaches, and postage. In order to encourage the drooping power of Austria to oppose France, even the poor of England were thus compelled to pay their share of taxation, and the leaders of the opposition declared that the course upon which England had entered must prove her ruin.

Bonaparte, who, after his return from Egypt, had effected the overthrow of the Directory, was now called the First Consul. Embodying the principal authority of the State, he attempted to obtain peace with England by addressing a letter to the king, in which he asked whether the war which had ravaged the world for eight years must be eternal. Why should the two most powerful and enlightened nations of Europe sacrifice their prosperity to war? The answer to this letter expressed the inability of the King of England to feel confidence in the stability of the French government, and censured the interference of France in the concerns of other countries. Talleyrand still pressed for a negotiation, and declared that France had been driven into war after the Révolution by the unprovoked hostility of several European powers. It was strongly urged in England by the advocates of peace that the new French administration was acting with prudence and moderation. The churches had been reopened, and the people, disgusted with the anarchy which had so long reigned in Paris, hailed

¹ Stanhope, iii. 93.

² Stanhope's 'Pitt,' iii. 220-251.

eagerly the re-establishment of order. In Parliament, the war policy of Pitt was still supported by large majorities in both Houses; but at a public meeting in London, very numerous attended, a petition was signed by numbers praying for an immediate negotiation with France.¹

The principal Act passed at the commencement of the new century was the Parliamentary Union of Great Britain and Ireland. It had been foreseen that, sooner or later, Ireland, like Scotland, must surrender her separate Assembly. 'Parliamentary government,' says Macaulay, 'cannot be carried on by two equal and independent Parliaments in one empire.'² The same writer has declared in another place that Mr. Pitt 'was the first English minister who formed great designs for the benefit of Ireland.'³ Those designs, which might have prevented the rebellion of 1798, had been foiled. In order to prevent hostile collisions between the two Parliaments, the English government had exerted a degree of influence in Ireland which deprived the Irish Houses of independence. The conduct of the Protestant faction in Ireland during the late insurrection had shown that little justice could be expected towards the Roman Catholic population. Pitt's intention had been to relieve the Catholic laity from all civil disabilities, and so far to extend the equal protection of the law as to leave no regret for the Irish Parliament, which had been both tyrannical and corrupt. Influenced by a general hope of amelioration, many Roman Catholics either remained neutral or supported the union. But a bitter disappointment awaited them. The king, unfortunately, believed himself bound by his coronation oath to maintain the existing Test Acts, and his sensitiveness on this subject again disturbed his reason. The vote in favour of the union was not carried in Ireland without a very strenuous opposition. In Dublin and its neighbourhood the people were outrageous against a measure which would, as they considered, degrade Ireland. The patriot Grattan obtained a seat by purchase in order to raise his voice against it. Influence of various kinds, including the promise of titles and pensions, obtained a majority of forty-two votes for union in the Irish House of Commons.⁴ On August 2, 1800, the Irish Parliament met for the last time.

A hundred Irish members were added to the English House of Commons; twenty-eight peers, chosen by the Irish nobility,

¹ Stanhope's 'Pitt,' iii. 218.

² Macaulay's 'History of England,' iv. 57.

³ Macaulay's 'Biography of Pitt,' p. 209.

⁴ Stanhope, iii. 223.

for life, and four bishops, to take their places by rotation, were added to the House of Lords. On February 2, 1801, when George III. addressed the first united Parliament, he was compelled to notice the unfavourable progress of the war, in which England could not reckon on the aid of a single valuable ally. Northern Italy had again yielded to Bonaparte, who obtained a brilliant victory over the Austrians on the plains of Marengo in June, 1800, and in Germany the French arms had similar success.

After vainly endeavouring to shake the king's determination and to obtain for the Catholics their just share of political rights, Pitt unwillingly resigned. Addington, the Speaker of the House of Commons, was his successor. Few things in our history, says Lord Stanhope, are more to be regretted than this inflexible determination of the king against the Roman Catholic claims. That measure of conciliation for which Pitt, a powerful and favourite minister, had contended in vain, was at last unwillingly recommended by the Duke of Wellington, in 1829, to avoid civil war. But 'how fierce and long was the intervening conflict!'¹

Pitt was so strongly impressed with the danger to Ireland from the inevitable disappointment of the Catholics, that he suggested the circulation of a conciliatory paper. After warning the Catholics against seditious associations, this short expostulation unfortunately encouraged them to rely on eminent men, pledged against service in any government which should persist in the refusal of their privileges.² When Pitt left office, it had certainly been his intention not to resume the administration without the power of passing a measure of which he had maintained the urgency. But the king's malady returning, in February, 1801, Pitt was compelled to assure him that he would never again bring before him the Catholic question. Other statesmen also of more liberal views, who in after years held the reins of government, found it necessary to observe the same restraint.³ Lord Cornwallis, moreover, retired from the viceroyalty of Ireland, confiding to private friends his opinion of the impolicy of the old system of exclusion. But the majority of the English people had more sympathy with the fears of the king than with the broad principle of religious toleration.

¹ Stanhope's 'Pitt,' iii. 281.

² This paper, although anonymous, was well known to proceed from the lord-lieutenant.—Stanhope, 288.

³ *Ib.*, iii. 295-312.

The French army which General Bonaparte left in Egypt was eager to return to France, and the English were as impatient to dislodge them. Reduced as the French were, they overcame with ease the vastly superior numbers of the Turkish levies brought against them by the grand vizier; indeed, they continued in possession of Egypt until 1801, when an English force, commanded by General Abercromby, landed at Aboukir Bay. The victory of the English was overclouded by the death of their brave commander; but the English arms, aided by the Turks and by a force from India which had crossed the desert, compelled the surrender of the French generals at Cairo and Alexandria. The terms of capitulation provided that the French troops should be conveyed to the shores of France, with their arms and artillery. Thus, on August 27, 1801, Egypt was at last reconquered.¹ Already France and England had commenced negotiations for peace.

The league of the northern powers, Russia, Sweden, and Denmark—termed by themselves an armed neutrality—by which Bonaparte hoped to withstand the naval supremacy of Great Britain, had been foiled by the victory which Lord Nelson obtained at Copenhagen in April, 1801, and by the death of the Emperor Paul of Russia.

The necessity for a speedy end to the long war had become so urgent that the English ministers could no longer acquiesce in the king's determination of the previous year, not to negotiate for peace whilst 'French principles' were unchanged.² Although out of office, Mr. Pitt was consulted by the government and gave material assistance in the discussion of those conditions which were afterwards ratified in the peace of Amiens. Both France and England, weighed down by grievous burdens, eagerly hailed the prospect of peace. When, on October 10, 1801, General Lauriston, in the service of the first consul, brought the ratification of the preliminary articles to London, a multitude escorted his carriage, took out the horses, and drew him through several streets in triumph. On that night and the following, London was illuminated. These feelings were reciprocated in France. When, indeed, the inhabitants of Brest heard of the preliminaries, they sent a flag of truce to the English naval officers, with congratulations.³

The only conquests retained by England were Trinidad and

¹ Stanhope's 'Pitt,' iii. 350.

² See the king's letter to Mr. Pitt of June 28, 1800. Stanhope, vol. iii. appendix, xxi.

³ See 'Memoirs of Lord Collingwood.'

Ceylon. Egypt was restored to Turkey, and Malta to the Knights of St. John. But, although the interests of England were not greatly extended, a larger majority in the House of Commons approved the conditions of peace than had ever supported the war, and the popular feeling was shown at the ensuing elections.¹

Addington, the successor but the inferior of Pitt, enjoyed a temporary popularity. But, unhappily, Napoleon Bonaparte would not yet devote himself to the noble task of benefiting France by mild and wise legislation. The treaty of Amiens had scarcely been signed when it became apparent in England that the tenure of peace was most precarious.²

The grasp extended by France over Piedmont and Switzerland, the sensitiveness of Bonaparte on account of the French emigrants residing in England, and concerning certain aggressive articles which appeared in English newspapers, soon proved that another crisis was at hand. On May 16, 1803, a message from the king called for the support of the House of Commons in withstanding the ambitious and encroaching policy of France. On the 18th a declaration of war was published on the part of England. A stroke of policy now conceived by Bonaparte is said to have been unpopular even in France, while it added greatly to the hostility of the English. Several thousand English subjects, who had repaired to France in confidence that the peace so recently concluded would not be abruptly broken, were arrested by a decree of May 27, and detained during the whole remainder of the war.

Bonaparte had determined to invade England at the head of his victorious troops, and formed a camp upon the coast adjoining the Straits of Dover. On the English side of the Channel there was the utmost determination to resist any such attempt. Party feeling was merged in the stronger call of patriotism, and the Act for the enrolment of a volunteer force, to consist of all men between the ages of seventeen and fifty-five, was supported by Mr. Fox and by others, lately the most anxious for the maintenance of peace.³ Before the close of the summer it was said that upwards of 300,000 volunteers had been enrolled. To enable the French to pass the Channel, a vast supply of flat-bottomed boats was prepared, and the ports adjoining Boulogne rang with the din of the artificers.

Pitt, who was lord warden of the Cinque Ports, and passed

¹ Massey's 'Reign of George III.,' iv. 647.

² Macaulay, Biographies, 'Pitt,' p. 217.

³ Fox came up from St. Anne's Hill on purpose.—Stanhope, iv. 66.

much of his time at Walmer Castle, near Deal, raised by his own exertions a regiment of 3,000 men, of which he was colonel, and was continually on horseback in the service. These preparations were made to guard against no imaginary danger. If the French should land, as they evidently intended, the first duty of opposing them would fall on those volunteers.¹ Nor was the ardour exhibited by any means confined to young men. In October, 1803, Pitt attended a public dinner on the enrolment of the officers of the Trinity House Volunteers, 'a number of gallant old men who had during the best part of their lives been beating the waves, and who now came forward with the zeal and spirit of lads, swearing allegiance to the king, with a determined purpose to act manfully in his defence, and for the protection of the capital.'² Lord Eldon afterwards noted the review of troops which the king held on two days of the same month, as the finest sight which he had ever witnessed.

In spite, however, of the general excitement and intrepidity, Pitt complained of the unaccountable negligence and inactivity of the government; and, perceiving that Addington was unequal to the direction of affairs at this crisis, he urged the formation of a new administration. This, he thought, should impartially unite men of the highest talents and connexions, 'without reference to former differences and divisions.' Pitt, indeed, was ready to resume the lead, urging, however, that both his former antagonists should have prominent places assigned them.

Foreseeing that the contest on which England had again entered might be probably 'of very long duration, and attended with heavy burdens,' Pitt wished to disarm opposition by union.

It was no longer a question concerning the expediency of interfering with the political course of a neighbouring nation. France had become a triumphant military power, bent on the subjugation of Europe, and as England had been by far the most resolute opponent, the full force of France was directed against this country. French 'Jacobinism had been stripped of the name and pretence of liberty. It had shown itself to be capable only of destroying, not of building, and with a military despotism as its necessary end.'³ The king, however, obstinately refused to sanction the appointment of Charles James Fox, to whom he was averse both on account of the strong senti-

¹ Stanhope, iv. 88.

² Extract from Mr. Rose's Diary of October 3, 1803—cited by Lord Stanhope, iv. 94.

³ Mr. Pitt's speech when approving of the treaty of peace, November, 1801.—Stanhope, iii. 361.

ments avowed by that statesman and of his friendly connexion with the Prince of Wales. The return of the king's malady for a short time, in February, 1804, again suggesting the thought of a regency, made it the more desirable to reconcile political parties, but yet increased the difficulty of arguing with the king; and, after expressing his disappointment at the failure of his project, Pitt returned to office in May, 1804.

At this time, when all eyes were fixed on France with awe and apprehension, Bonaparte violated the law of nations, in ordering the arrest of the young Duke d'Enghien, a Bourbon prince, who was residing on the neutral territory of Baden. This was effected by a detachment of French soldiers at night, and the duke was conducted to the castle of Vincennes, near Paris. A mock trial was immediately followed by his execution, on March 21. At the news of this murder a thrill of horror ran through Europe, and it has been said that this act was the principal cause of the ensuing European war.¹

Bonaparte, no longer satisfied with the title of First Consul, obtained in May a decree of the French Senate, according to which he was proclaimed sovereign of France, with the title of the Emperor Napoleon. The dread of an immediate invasion had diminished in England, some persons even disbelieving in the reality of the past danger, but evidence has been furnished, by the recent publication of Napoleon's official correspondence, of the earnestness of his intentions as to this matter. He had entered upon negotiations with the Pope, who had promised to visit Paris and perform the ceremony of his coronation in the cathedral of Notre Dame; but, hoping to have returned in triumph from the conquest of England, Napoleon caused that ceremony to be deferred till November. The die of a medal was already prepared to commemorate the anticipated victory, and the medal would, so Napoleon intended, be struck off in London.² But, happily both for England and France, Admiral Latouche Tréville, to whom the direction of this great enterprise had been assigned, and who had planned to depart from Toulon, as if on the way to Egypt, fell ill, before entering the British Channel, and died on August 20. Napoleon was compelled at the last to defer the expedition, and was crowned by the Pope in solemn state at Paris on December 2.

By his command, certain deviations from the established

¹ Thiers's '*Histoire du Consulat et de l'Empire*,' v. 2, and Stanhope's '*Life of Pitt*,' iv. 198.

² Stanhope, iv. On one side was the head of Napoleon crowned with laurel; on the reverse, Hercules crushing the monster Antæus.

usage were made in the ceremony. The Pope blessed the crown, but Napoleon took it from him and placed it on his own head. Josephine knelt before him and received from his hands the imperial diadem.

The custom of impressing sailors to serve in the British navy was at this period frequently the occasion of cruel hardship. All sailors in trading-vessels, fishermen, and others accustomed to a seafaring life, if not previously regularly apprenticed to a calling, were liable, between the ages of eighteen and fifty-five, to be seized and compelled to serve in ships of war. For this purpose tenders were stationed off the English ports, and 'press-gangs,' as they were called, were sent ashore, who frequently captured men just returning from long voyages. Sad were the scenes when innocent men were hiding in panic from the pursuit of naval officers, and terrible the necessity which was thought sufficient excuse for such a barbarous mode of obtaining the needful number of recruits.

At the beginning of 1805, the Emperor Napoleon addressed another letter to the King of England, whom he now styled 'brother,' expressing in very general terms his strong desire for peace. In the opinion of Pitt and his colleagues, this proposal was designed for popular effect. The answer which was sent, according to the constitutional form, from Lord Mulgrave to M. de Talleyrand, declared that the king also desired peace, but that he could only agree to terms in unison with other European powers, among whom the Emperor of Russia was especially named.

The anxieties of the time were very depressing to those who conducted the English administration. Spain was taking part with France. Pitt had succeeded in forming another great coalition by uniting Austria and Russia with England, to oppose the ambition of the common enemy. But all appeared to have been in vain, when the news reached England that while the English troops were preparing to embark for Germany, and the Russian forces were slowly coming up from Poland, Napoleon, with unprecedented energy, had moved 100,000 men from the coast to the Black Forest, and had compelled a great Austrian army to surrender at Ulm.¹ But while all the efforts of diplomacy, and all the gold lavished on the allies, failed to stem the tide of French victory, British valour availed to preserve England from attack. Lord Nelson and Admiral Collingwood, in command of the British fleet, had watched the

¹ Macaulay, Biographies, p. 227. General Mack surrendered at Ulm, without fighting, on October 17, 1805.

movements of the French with unceasing vigilance for two years. Twice Nelson pursued the French admiral across the Atlantic, for it had been planned by Napoleon that Villeneuve should first sail to the West Indies to attract thither a large portion of the English fleet, and then, after junction with the Spaniards, return, an invincible armada, to Boulogne.¹ In September, Lord Nelson was able to make a short visit to England, and refresh his men after their long service, and he now accepted the command of the fleet destined to meet the enemy off Cadiz.

On September 14, Nelson left Portsmouth for the last time; on the 29th he was off Cadiz. On November 7, four days after intelligence had been received of the capitulation at Ulm, followed the news of Nelson's victory off Trafalgar, overshadowed, however, by the tidings of his death. Then it was that Nelson had issued to his fleet the famous signal: 'England expects every man to do his duty.' Mortally wounded by a rifle ball during the action, Nelson yet lived long enough to know that the English had gained the most decisive and important naval victory of the age, and that fifteen of the French and Spanish ships had already struck. He died on board his own ship, the 'Victory.' Villeneuve was among the prisoners.

Two days afterwards, on November 9, Pitt, as prime minister, dined, according to custom, with the lord mayor. The tidings of victory excited the people to welcome him with renewed favour; they took the horses from his carriage in Cheapside, and drew him to the banquet. Complimented by the lord mayor as 'the saviour of Europe'—words as yet unjustified by events—Mr. Pitt appropriately declared his 'hope that England, having saved herself by her energy, may save Europe by her example.'² Among the guests on that day was the great general who became in after years the successful adversary of Napoleon, Sir Arthur Wellesley, who had very lately returned from India. As the successful commander in the battles of Assaye and Argaum, in 1803, Sir Arthur had commenced his long career of victory, and had materially aided in securing the British rule in India. At the same time that the continental war and the defence of the English shores were the subject of deep anxiety, a conflict took place in the House of Commons, in the spring of 1805, respecting the conduct of Lord Melville, who was accused of 'highly culpable laxity' in

¹ Stanhope, iv. 320.

² These words became the more memorable, being the last ever spoken by him in public.—Stanhope, iv. 346.

disbursing the public money as treasurer of the navy.¹ Mr. Pitt in vain endeavoured to screen his friend and colleague, Henry Dundas, from the charges brought against him by the leaders of the opposition, who were joined on this occasion by Mr. Wilberforce, and by other members who usually supported Pitt. It was at that time nearly unprecedented for the ministry to be left in a minority, but the numbers on the division were equal, and the Speaker reluctantly gave the casting-vote against Lord Melville, who immediately afterwards resigned his office.² After this vote of censure, Pitt saw the necessity of erasing Lord Melville's name from the list of privy councillors, which resolution cost him, he declared, 'a deep and bitter pang.' At his own request, Lord Melville appeared in the House of Commons on June 11, and in a speech of two hours endeavoured to vindicate himself, denying that he had used any part of the £20,000, of which no account was given, for any personal profit, but asserting that he was unable to divulge the public objects to which it had been applied. This defence not satisfying the House, it was debated whether to proceed against him by impeachment or by prosecution, and it was owing to the wish of Lord Melville's friends that the form of impeachment was adopted, the trial being deferred to the next session of Parliament.

The English government hoped, after the capitulation of Ulm, that the combined Russian and Austrian forces might prove superior to the French, and that the vacillating King of Prussia would join the allies. But the Emperor Napoleon's triumphant progress defeated all Pitt's calculations. From Ulm he proceeded to Munich, driving the Austrians before him, and entered Vienna on November 13. On December 2, he utterly defeated the combined forces of Austria and Russia at Austerlitz,³ the most splendid of all his achievements. The three Emperors, of France, Austria, and Russia, were all on the field of battle, the numbers on both sides being nearly equal, but the loss of the allies was tremendous. The Emperor of Austria immediately sued for peace, and made great sacrifices to obtain it. By the treaty, which was soon afterwards arranged at Presburg, the Germanic empire was constituted anew. The Emperor Francis was henceforward only Emperor of Austria, no longer the elected Emperor of Germany. The Princes of Bavaria and Wurtemberg, who allied themselves with France,

¹ Macaulay, 'Biography of Pitt.'

² Lord Stanhope, iv. 295. The House did not rise till half-past five in the morning after this debate.

³ In Moravia.

were rewarded by an extension of their territories and by the kingly title. Hanover, which, since the accession of George I., had been connected with the English monarchy, had been subdued by Bonaparte in 1803. The disastrous intelligence of the defeat at Austerlitz, with the total destruction of the new coalition on which all his hopes were based, utterly overpowered Mr. Pitt, then in rapidly declining health. Frequent mention has been made of the despair with which the great minister on his return desired that the map of Europe should be rolled up. 'It will be,' said he, 'no more wanted for many years.' Typhus fever succeeded, and he expired on January 23, in his forty-seventh year, and on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the day on which he first took his seat in Parliament. It was said that Pitt's last words expressed his anxiety for his country; illness obscured his mind, but broken exclamations proved that his wandering thoughts were still dwelling on the absorbing interest which had occupied his life.¹ For nearly nineteen years, excepting the term of Addington's administration, Pitt was first lord of the treasury, and the undisputed chief of the ministry. With the exception of Walpole, no English statesman had held the supreme power so long since the establishment of Parliamentary government.²

The House of Commons decreed a public funeral in Westminster Abbey and the erection of a monument in his honour. On February 22, an unusually splendid train followed him to the grave. The House also voted £40,000 in payment of Mr. Pitt's debts, which had accumulated, not from prodigality but from want of superintendence.

Lord Grenville, when summoned to form an administration, required that one of the principal offices should be given to Fox, and the king, although he had refused the same request when made two years before by Pitt, immediately acquiesced. Lord Grenville then became first lord of the treasury, Fox foreign secretary of state, and Addington, then Lord Sidmouth, returned to office as privy seal.

Since the year 1784, when the king suddenly dismissed the administration, soon after the death of Lord Rockingham, Fox had been either a leader of opposition or in retirement. His tenure of office was short, for he soon fell into ill-health, and died on the following September 13.

¹ See Macaulay's Biography, p. 230.

² 'Walpole,' says Macaulay, 'was first lord of the treasury during more than twenty years,' but he had been some time in that position before 'he could be properly called prime minister.'

One of the objects on which he had set his heart was the abolition of the slave trade throughout the British dominions.¹

The king expressed regret at the death of Mr. Fox, who had at last won his regard. The long-deferred trial of Lord Melville was begun in Westminster Hall on April 29, 1806, and, after sixteen days, concluded with his acquittal. This trial, like the impeachment of Hastings, tended to confirm official responsibility.

The great object of the English government was now the prosecution of the war with France.² When Napoleon was baffled in his project of invading England, he determined on a scheme for the ruin of the British manufacturers, by which he trusted to cripple the resources with which Great Britain stimulated the continental war. On November 20, 1806, after the battle of Jena, and the subsequent humiliation of Prussia, Napoleon issued, from the royal palace at Berlin, a decree which declared all British subjects, wherever found, prisoners of war, and all articles of British manufacture, wherever captured, lawful prize; and he strictly forbade intercourse with British subjects under severe penalties. The English government, in retaliation, issued 'orders in council,' which prohibited all vessels which had touched at any French port from entering a port of Great Britain, authorising the seizure of their cargoes. By these orders, English commerce underwent still further injury, neutrals were deeply offended, and the provocation given to America led a few years afterwards to war. By granting subsidies to Napoleon's opponents, England had drawn down upon herself the emperor's deadly enmity, and she now looked in vain for allies.

On July 1, 1807, the Emperors Napoleon and Alexander held an important interview on a raft moored on the river Niemen at Tilsit. The imperial guards of France and Russia were drawn up on the opposite banks, when the two emperors were rowed by distinguished officers to the pavilion which had been erected. The conference was private, but it was known to be friendly, and that active measures were proposed against England.

The whole of Northern Germany was now placed under the rule of Jerome Bonaparte, younger brother of Napoleon, under the name of the kingdom of Westphalia.

¹ This bill received the royal assent in March, 1807. Slaves were still employed in the British West Indies, the completed Act of abolition not being passed till 1834.

² The Tory administration of the Duke of Portland having succeeded that of Lord Grenville in 1807.

It was now impossible for any of the lesser states to maintain their independence against France. Sweden had ventured to remain in alliance with England, and had afforded a refuge to the princes of the House of Bourbon. Denmark commanded by its position the entrance of the Baltic, and had a fleet which was liable to be employed by Napoleon. Aware of this danger, the English government required the Crown Prince of Denmark to place his fleet under British custody until the close of the war, promising that it should be faithfully restored. The prince having refused this demand, Copenhagen was bombarded by a British force, and set on fire by the newly invented Congreve rockets. The inhabitants showed great courage, striving to extinguish the flames, which destroyed 1,800 houses before the capitulation took place, after which all the Danish ships of war and military stores were removed to England.

The King of Denmark did not long survive this blow, and his successor joined the coalition against Great Britain, to which Sweden was also reluctantly compelled to accede.¹ The Bourbon princes took refuge in England, the only country strong enough to protect them, and the sole remaining bulwark against the overwhelming power of France.

Portugal being one of Great Britain's oldest allies and of great commercial importance, Napoleon determined to compel that country to close her ports against English commerce, and to sacrifice the property of the British residents. The Prince Regent of Portugal had not sufficient power to resist the French, but he gave his English friends timely warning of their danger, and determined to depart to the Portuguese settlement in Brazil, rather than remain in subjection to France.

Only a short time intervened before a French army approached Lisbon from Spain, but while the French drew near the city, the fleet stationed in the Tagus, accompanied by a strong British squadron, bore away the royal family of Portugal with their treasure. About eighteen thousand Portuguese subjects thus abandoned their country. It had been, indeed, already announced at Paris that the 'House of Braganza' had ceased to reign.

Spain had been suffering from a weak and immoral government. Napoleon allured the king beyond the Pyrenees, and induced him to accept an asylum in France, in order that he might place his brother Joseph, King of Naples, on the Spanish throne. The Spanish grandees were summoned to Bayonne,

¹ Sir Edward Cust's 'Wars of the Nineteenth Century,' ii. 56.

where they did homage, as they were required, to King Joseph, but a considerable number of the people resented the intrusion of the French. They met together in popular assemblies, called in Spain 'juntas,' and sent deputies to England to explain their situation. The English government, after seeking in vain for allies, was delighted to receive the deputation, which brought a petition to 'the magnanimous monarch of Great Britain,' and the Spaniards were welcomed with great cordiality and entertained by the corporation of London.

Nominally, England and Spain were still at war, and the Spanish fleet, in junction with that of France, had been destroyed by Nelson at Trafalgar. Peace was therefore hastily concluded; the Spanish prisoners of war were liberated, clothed, and restored to serve against the French, public subscriptions being raised for their relief.

Sir Arthur Wellesley was appointed, in June, 1808, to the command of 9,000 infantry with the promise of a speedy reinforcement. He landed his troops at Mondego Bay, on August 1, with the objects of rescuing Portugal from French domination and of opening communication between the north and south of Spain. He found nearly the whole of Portugal in insurrection against the French, but without a regular force, as the officers had chiefly gone off to Brazil. An attack made by the French general Junot on the English at Vimieiro was repulsed, with great loss to the French; and in September the British commanders took possession of the forts of Lisbon in the name of the Prince Regent of Portugal.¹ The Portuguese manifested great joy at their deliverance from the French, but Napoleon was in Madrid at the beginning of winter with a force of 200,000 men.

Spain was to be the field on which the great question was to be decided—whether France should rule over Europe. Sir John Moore landed in Portugal after the battle of Vimieiro, and was directed to operate against the French in the north of Spain. He had penetrated as far as Salamanca, when the Spanish reverses and the overwhelming forces of the French General Soult obliged him to retreat upon Corunna. The march through a mountainous region, covered with deep snow, was extremely difficult, but the army had just reached Corunna,

¹ Sir Hugh Dalrymple and Sir Harry Burrard had been placed over General Wellesley in Portugal, with additional forces. The terms of the negotiation called 'The Convention of Cintra,' by which the French agreed to leave Portugal, and the English commanders to land them on the French coast by English vessels, were the subject of much censure. A court of inquiry, which was held in England, decided in their favour. See Sir Edward Cust's 'Wars of the Nineteenth Century,' ii. 119.

and the sick and wounded were already placed on board the English ships, when Soult compelled the exhausted forces to give battle. The English, however, gallantly repulsed their pursuers, although with the loss of their brave general.¹

In the defence of Saragossa, twice besieged by the French in 1808, the Spaniards showed great intrepidity. They once compelled the enemy to raise the siege, but the French, returning in November with a larger force, at length proved victorious, although it was not till January 27 that they penetrated into the city. Old men, women, and children had joined in the defence, contending street by street and house by house. A woman who had distinguished herself upon the ramparts became celebrated as the 'Maid of Saragossa.' But when opposed in the field to the experienced French troops, the Spaniards were always beaten. In the spring of 1809 the English government became aware that only by great exertions could Portugal be preserved, and the Spaniards assisted in their struggle against the French; and the chief command of the British army in Spain was happily given to Sir Arthur Wellesley. The difficulties of his position tried to the utmost the great abilities of the English general. His forces were very small compared with the French, and on both sides it was difficult to obtain sufficient food without plunder. The French were accustomed to pillage the unfortunate peasants, and were frequently the victims of their ferocity.

In July, Sir Arthur defeated King Joseph at Talavera, the first great victory over the French by land. The British forces were too much reduced to pursue their advantage, but great satisfaction was shown in England, and Sir Arthur was raised to the peerage by the title of Lord Wellington.

Napoleon had placed Holland under the nominal rule of his brother Louis, and had added the greater part of the Netherlands to the French empire. The English government resolved to send a strong force against Antwerp, where the French had formed arsenals and dockyards, and to seize the fleet. It was hoped that this expedition might prove as successful as that against Copenhagen.

Accordingly, on July 28, a large British fleet swept through the Channel, carrying 40,000 soldiers to the mouth of the Scheldt. But the planners of this disastrous expedition did not calculate upon the evil influence of the climate which the troops

¹ The lines referring to the event are well known.

'We buried him darkly at dead of night,
The sods with our bayonets turning.'

encountered when they landed in August on the marshy island of Walcheren, where numbers were immediately attacked by pestilential fever. Before the end of the year the enterprise was abandoned, after the loss of nearly half of the British army, and the greater part of the regiments which returned to England proved unfit for military duty. The money thrown away was estimated at twenty millions, besides the sacrifice of many thousand lives without result.

While these disasters overclouded the year 1809, the government arranged a public 'jubilee' to celebrate the fiftieth year of the king's reign, he himself the while gradually encountering the loss of his sight and his reason together. Indeed, before the next anniversary, the reign of George III. had virtually closed.

The power of Napoleon had meanwhile become nearly despotic on the continent, and he compelled those countries of which his brothers were nominally the sovereigns to supply men and money for his armies. Yet so long as he remained without an heir, Napoleon perceived that his power was unstable. His wife, Josephine, reluctantly consented to a divorce; and, by a marriage with the young Archduchess Maria Louisa, he determined to place himself on a formal level with those hereditary sovereigns to whom his arms enabled him to dictate. After marriage by proxy at Vienna, the archduchess was married to the Emperor at Paris with great pomp, by his uncle, Cardinal Fesch. The next year a son was born to him, who received the title of King of Rome. The Pope had dared to excommunicate Napoleon, and in consequence had been imprisoned; and the papal territory was divided into two French departments, Rome being called the second city of the empire.

CHAPTER XXXVII.

THE REGENCY—GEORGE IV.

A.D. 1810–1820 : 1820–1830.

THE return of the king's malady, in 1810, occasioned warm debates in Parliament respecting the powers to be entrusted to the Prince of Wales. Political differences had increased the estrangement between the king and his eldest son; and it was urged that if the prince should adopt his own policy, make concessions to the Roman Catholics, and then the king's reason return, the worst consequences might ensue. Under these circumstances, at the beginning of February, the Prince of Wales became regent, with restricted powers, for one year only. At the end of that time, the king's illness continuing without hope of change, the prince assumed the full power of an English sovereign, retaining in office the former ministers. The misery of the people was increased, in the latter part of 1811, by formidable riots. Machinery adopted in the hosiery trade at Nottingham had caused the discharge of many weavers, who, attributing all their distress to these new contrivances, formed hostile gangs to destroy the machinery throughout the district. These machine-breakers were called Luddites, from the name of a half-crazy leader. In Lancashire, Cheshire, and Yorkshire, cloth-mills were also destroyed; at length many of the rioters were executed after trial by special commission. The distress occasioned by the prolonged continental war was still further increased by a war with the United States. This was extremely unpopular in England, having been provoked by the orders in council formerly issued by the English government. According to these the British captains were to stop vessels belonging to neutral powers if suspected of carrying goods to countries with which England was at war, a proviso which affected trade with nearly the whole of Europe, excepting Spain and Portugal. The American government invaded Canada; the British force

succeeded in repelling that invasion, but the Americans had several times the advantage in the encounters at sea. The war was concluded towards the end of 1814, with a treaty negotiated at Ghent, the news of which, however, did not reach America in time to prevent the bloody battle of New Orleans.¹

In the early months of 1812, a strong reaction against the oppressive exactions of Napoleon began to stir northern Europe. The Emperor of Russia broke off his alliance with France, and found an ally in Bernadotte, Crown Prince of Sweden, a Frenchman, who had formerly served under Napoleon. But Napoleon now determined on invading Russia with an immense army. He convoked the Kings of Bavaria, Wurtemberg, Saxony, and Westphalia, all of whom owed to him their royal titles, to a conference in May. The Emperor of Austria also came to Dresden, and the King of Prussia, from whose reduced army Napoleon required an aid of 20,000 men. From all these sources, a larger army was obtained than had ever before been collected in Europe under one general; and with these united forces the invasion of Russia was begun. Even at the end of June, at the outset of the campaign, to obtain supplies was difficult. The provinces which were first entered were thinly peopled, and the harvest was scanty. A battle was fought at Borodino on September 7, the Russians and French each numbering about 120,000 men, where, after immense slaughter, the French emperor was at length victorious.

On the 14th, Napoleon entered Moscow. Most of the inhabitants had left that city by command; those Russians who remained set it on fire, and, in spite of the efforts of the French, four-fifths of Moscow was destroyed by its own citizens. Famine, and the rigour of an unusually early winter, made it impossible for the French to remain. Napoleon lingered for about five weeks, reluctant to abandon so costly an enterprise; but the retreat began on October 19. The advance had been difficult; the retreat over the same country was starvation, and the French were continually exposed to attacks from the Russians as well as from flying parties of wild Cossacks. Their march across the vast desolate plains was arrested by the nipping blasts of winter. Those who were engaged in this disastrous expedition have left a record of their sufferings. Dead horses furnished the principal supply of food, and even the marshals of the army were often in want of bread.²

¹ On January 7, 1815, the Americans being victorious, under the command of General Jackson.

² See letter to King Joseph.—Second volume of Correspondence, p. 241.

‘Like the true soldier, grave but calm,’ Napoleon for some time continued with the army on the retreat, but on December 5 he separated himself from the scattered remnants, traversed Poland on a sledge, and reached Paris on the 18th.¹ He had already sent home the bulletin announcing the ruin of his army, at once the dismay of France, and the revival of hope to the long-oppressed nations. Of all that mighty host which had set forth to invade Russia, the imperial guard alone remained. Napoleon immediately took measures for re-establishing his army by fresh conscriptions, by the employment of sailors, and by the reduction of the troops serving in Spain. In England, Parliament granted £200,000 before Christmas for the relief of the suffering Russians. Deeply as the English felt the pressure of taxation, their loss of commerce and of men, they were grateful that their land had been secured from invasion. Meantime, Lord Wellington had been successful in Spain, where he had brought his army into the highest state of discipline, and he exerted himself as much as possible to protect the peasantry. ‘Every peasant,’ so wrote a French officer, ‘wishes to be under Wellington’s protection.’ In July, 1812, he obtained a victory over Marshal Marmont at Salamanca, upon which he was created Marquis of Wellington, receiving the thanks of Parliament, and a grant of £100,000. The French troops in Spain still greatly outnumbered the English, but, at the beginning of the campaign of 1813, Wellington was nominated commander-in-chief of the Spanish armies, and measures were taken to promote the efficiency of their troops.

The situation of Joseph Bonaparte on the throne of Spain was alike painful and inglorious. He had foretold that in that contest his brother’s glory would be dimmed, and in vain entreated Napoleon’s permission to resign his crown.² In February, 1813, the King of Prussia entered into alliance with Russia against France—the first step towards the liberation of Germany. Still apparently invincible, Napoleon began the campaign of 1813 in Germany, in May, by defeating the Russians and Prussians united at Lutzen. The Emperor of Austria endeavoured to mediate, but Napoleon refused all concessions. In this situation of affairs, there spread through Europe the news of the most complete victory which Wellington had hitherto won. The battle was fought at Vittoria on June 21. King Joseph’s carriage was seized, leaving him but just time to escape on horseback, abandoning to the enemy his baggage, artillery,

¹ Sir Edward Cust’s ‘Wars of the Nineteenth Century,’ iv. 310.

² Correspondence, ii. 134.

ammunition, equipments, and the staff of a French marshal. Napoleon thereupon sent Marshal Soult to Spain to assume the chief command, and Joseph finally retired from his unhappy position. Notwithstanding the family connexion, the Emperor of Austria now joined the alliance against France.

Victorious, though losing strength, Napoleon retreated in the autumn to Leipzig, closely followed by Russians, Austrians, Prussians, and Swedes. 'Give me but one more victory,' said he, 'and Germany may yet be saved.'¹ Two bloody battles were fought at Leipzig, but in neither of them did he gain the desired result. The second battle took place on October 18, when, in the midst of the conflict, the Saxon force of 10,000 men, arrayed on the side of Napoleon, raised a patriotic shout for Germany, and joined the ranks of the allies—a desertion which obliged the French to make a precipitate retreat, surrendering 25,000 prisoners. On November 9, Napoleon was again at Paris, unsupported by a single ally. Holland declared herself independent, and recalled her former ruler, the Prince of Orange.

The great reverses sustained by the army, and the approach of the allies to the frontiers, at length roused a spirit of resistance in the Lower Chamber. They expressed their desire for peace, and began to speak of the rights of Frenchmen—language which Napoleon had never been inclined to tolerate. He found more subserviency in the Senate, or Upper Chamber, which ordered a conscription of 300,000 men, passing a decree, in addition, that the taxes should be doubled. It was in vain that Joseph Bonaparte, who was then in Paris, advised the emperor to yield to the pressure of circumstances, renounce his designs of further conquest, and be satisfied to be the ruler of France, within boundaries which would leave that country as extensive as it had ever been under the most powerful of its kings. He urged that, if the emperor would thus moderate his ambition, he might yet secure a lasting peace with the powers of Europe—advice, unhappily, no less distasteful than fruitless. In January, 1814, Napoleon began his last campaign, in which he displayed extraordinary military genius, and for two months he held at bay the allied armies of Russia, Austria, and Prussia in their advance upon Paris. On March 28 the empress left Paris with her son, never to return. After a battle fought by the French with great bravery, under General Marmont near Paris, in which the allies lost more than 9,000 men, the marshals of France agreed to withdraw their army, and no longer to oppose the entrance

¹ 'Saved,' to be under French domination!

of the allied sovereigns. On March 31 the Emperor of Russia and the King of Prussia entered Paris, the Parisians, who longed above all things for an end of the war, testifying little emotion. Nearly four hundred years had passed since the child-king of England, Henry VI., was crowned in Paris in 1431, and from that time till 1814, no foreign conqueror had entered the French capital. The allied sovereigns invited the Senate to determine the fate of the country, and on April 2 a decree was unanimously passed by that assembly, which, after specifying various acts, in which the emperor had violated the constitution, declared that by his refusal to treat with the allies on honourable conditions, he had forfeited both the throne and the right of inheritance which had been vested in his family, and that consequently all Frenchmen were absolved from further allegiance to his dynasty.¹

Napoleon was advancing to the relief of Paris when he met, near Fontainebleau, the troops which had been just dismissed from the defence; he also received a deputation of officers urgently advising his immediate abdication. He at once proposed to resign in favour of his son, but was informed that the Emperor of Russia insisted upon his entire renunciation of the sovereignty. After a few days of indecision at Fontainebleau, Napoleon, at last, on April 11, signed an Act renouncing *for ever*, for himself and his descendants, all claim to the crowns of France and Italy. The Emperor of Russia was willing to soothe the bitterness of his fall by allowing him to retain the title of emperor, and by consenting that the different branches of the Bonaparte family should retain their present titles. According to Napoleon's expressed wish, the little island of Elba was assigned him as a principality, and for his future residence, with a revenue of £100,000 per annum, to be paid to him and his heirs by the French exchequer.

Wellington had, during the first months of the year, won a series of brilliant victories, and now entered France on the south. He considered it his duty to free Spain from her invaders, and not to interfere with the government of France. The Duke of Angoulême had already landed in the southern provinces, which inclined to the Bourbons, but Wellington refused to act on his behalf, charging his army to remember that the object of the allies in entering France was peace.

Owing to the tardy transmission of even the most important intelligence, there was again a sad waste of life, when, on April 10, while Napoleon still hesitated at Fontainebleau, Soult

¹ Sir Edward Cust, iv. 253-260.

vainly attempted to oppose Wellington. Knowledge of what was then pending would at this moment have saved the lives of 8,000 men.

When, after this engagement, on April 12, Wellington entered Toulouse, he was received with great joy by the citizens, who, dreading a siege, had mounted the white cockade of the Bourbons. The civic officers presented him with the keys in the name of Louis XVIII., but the general declined to accept them on his behalf until assured that the provisional government at Paris had declared in favour of Louis.

Fifteen hundred of the old French guard were allowed to escort their fallen master to the coast; and, after taking an affectionate farewell of his old generals at Fontainebleau, Napoleon embarked for Elba on April 29 at Fréjus, the same port at which he landed in 1799 from Egypt. An English frigate was in waiting to convey him.

The great aim of the Moderate party at Paris was to secure peace and a constitution guaranteeing general freedom; with which view they offered the crown to the eldest brother of that unfortunate king who perished on the scaffold in 1793. Louis XVIII., after having accepted the conditions, made his public entry into Paris on May 3. The treaty with the allies fixed the boundaries of France almost as before the abolition of the monarchy. The Prince Regent conferred a dukedom on Wellington, who issued his farewell orders to the army, congratulating his soldiers on the peace which had rewarded their exertions, and on their general character for humanity. The other allied armies also withdrew from France, it having been arranged that a congress should meet at Vienna to provide for the future settlement of those countries which had been so greatly disturbed by the recent conflicts.

The Duke of Wellington received his new patents of nobility in the House of Lords on June 28, with the thanks of the House. On July 1 he attended the House of Commons and received the thanks of that assembly, and half a million of money, which was assigned for the purchase of a domain suitable to his rank.

During this summer London exulted in an unprecedented succession of feasts and public spectacles. The Emperor of Russia, the King of Prussia, and Marshal Blücher were the guests of the Prince Regent, accompanied by numerous lesser princes and noblemen, and received with general rejoicing. Many Englishmen seized the opportunity of the peace to visit France, from which they had been so long excluded; and it

was observed by travellers that, notwithstanding their past sufferings, the lower classes regretted Bonaparte. He had gratified their love of military glory, while they valued the rapid rise in the army which had of late been afforded them. Those of the middle rank, who thought of their homes and dreaded the conscription, rejoiced in peace, but were without attachment to the Bourbons.¹ Arbitrary and tyrannical as the rule of Napoleon had been, he had endeared himself to his soldiers by kindness; 'never,' says an English officer, 'quitting the field of battle without surveying, as far as he could, the state of the wounded, and trying to alleviate their sufferings.'² The new government looked with distrust on soldiers who had served with pride under the tricolour, and troops raised in the most loyal districts took the place of the old imperial guard. Discontent constantly follows a revolution in the government, and a large party in France soon resented what they thought the retrograde policy of the king, and the conduct of many of the restored emigrants.³ The imprudence of the allies in placing Napoleon within sight of Italy, where he had numerous devoted adherents and was within a few days' sail of France, was soon painfully apparent. The little principality of Elba did not restrain the emperor's movements more than ten months. In February, 1815, on the pretence of an intended expedition to the coast of Barbary, Napoleon prepared his hazardous enterprise. On the 27th he sailed from Elba, accompanied by about four hundred of his old comrades; 1,000 men being at the same time conveyed to France in three captured merchant vessels. When he had gained the open sea, he disclosed his intention, the announcement of which was received with acclamations by his followers.

Arriving at Cannes, near Fréjus, on March 1, he landed unexpectedly, without opposition. The country people eagerly welcomed their emperor, and the soldiers were delighted again to behold their honoured leader. In the course of one week Napoleon had gained possession of Grenoble, and issued imperial decrees. He assumed a tone of great moderation, acknowledging that he had been too fond of war, had aspired to make France the first of nations, and through France to rule the world. Now, however, he promised to respect the civil rights guaranteed by the Bourbons, and was ready to be a con-

¹ See Horner's *Correspondence*, October, 1814, ii. 206.

² Sir Edward Cust describes very favourably the conduct of Napoleon towards his soldiers after his great battles, i. 284, ii. 43, 156, 245.

³ Alison's *History of Europe*, xix. 225.

stitutional king. The Congress at Vienna, employed in discussing the condition of Europe, on March 7 received the astounding intelligence that the great adversary was again in France. They immediately signed a decree proscribing Napoleon as the public enemy, with whom it would be impossible to be at peace, and prepared for a renewal of war. The Duke of Wellington was attending the Congress at Vienna, as the representative of Great Britain, when the startling news arrived. On April 11 the allies appointed him to take the command of the army which was to be assembled in the Netherlands, and he soon afterwards went to Brussels to prepare for the conflict now impending. The position of Louis XVIII. was most difficult. The only army with which France could oppose Napoleon was strongly attached to its former leader. Before the king withdrew to Ghent for safety, he entrusted the command of the troops sent to oppose Napoleon's progress to Marshal Ney, one of the bravest officers, who accepted the post with apparently loyal intentions, assuring Louis that he would bring the emperor a prisoner to Paris. But before Ney reached Lyons, where the emperor was, a proclamation was placed in his hands irresistible to one who owed to Napoleon all the glory of his past career. Had Ney remained faithful to the king, his soldiers would have deserted his standard, but when, with his whole army, the marshal went over to their late emperor, all obstacles to his progress were at once removed. Louis quietly withdrew on March 19; on the 20th Napoleon, attended by all the soldiers sent to oppose him, re-entered Paris in triumph, and was received with corresponding exultation. So far he was victorious without bloodshed. During the three weeks since his landing not one shot had been fired. 'So sudden, complete, and bloodless a revolution,' wrote Sir Samuel Romilly, 'more resembles fiction than history.' Yet, although France felt little attachment towards the Bourbons, there were numbers who earnestly desired peace, 'whoever might be the sovereign.'¹ It was in vain that Napoleon tried to gain time, or to deceive his antagonists, by sending letters to assure the allied sovereigns of his willingness to maintain the established order.

At the head of troops which at present did not exceed 100,000 under arms, he was compelled to meet the armed hostility of Europe. The allies felt called upon to combine their whole strength to overcome once more the giant who had broken his bonds, and who, although he might now speak of peace, was truly the genius of war. It was determined that

¹ Sir S. Romilly's Diary.

the forces under the Duke of Wellington should be concentrated in Belgium.

By great exertions, Napoleon collected upon the frontiers of Flanders an army of 120,000 men, including all who remained of his veteran soldiers, and left Paris on June 11 to take the command. At Ligny, on the 16th, he attacked the Prussian general, Marshal Blücher, who was completely defeated, while another division of the French army, commanded by Ney, attacked the English forces, with considerable loss on both sides, at Quatre Bras.

On the 18th was fought the decisive battle of Waterloo. The French fought with great bravery, but their cavalry was nearly destroyed, and after the entire discomfiture of his guard, Napoleon rode off from the field in the dusk of the evening to return to Paris. This was the only engagement in which Wellington and Napoleon confronted one another. The English army had already obtained the victory when the Prussians arrived to secure the result and complete the French rout. It was a most destructive battle; the entire losses have been estimated at 100,000 men, and the Duke of Wellington is reported to have declared that 'nothing can compensate for the extreme misery caused by such a combat, save the reflection of the public good which may arise from it.' After the overwhelming defeat of his arms at Waterloo, Napoleon found no support from the House of Representatives. It was manifest that one man alone stood between France and the peace which the country so much needed, and no second battle could turn the tide. The Chambers appointed a provisional government, and Napoleon immediately left for Rochefort, hoping to find means to embark for the United States. After his departure, Paris capitulated; the allied sovereigns entered the city on July 7, and Louis XVIII. returned the next day to resume the sovereignty.

Finding the French coast beset by British cruisers, Napoleon determined to preserve the appearance of a voluntary surrender. In his despair he appealed to those whom he then styled 'the most magnanimous' of his enemies, by going on board the 'Bellerophon,' commanded by Captain Maitland. 'He wished to place himself,' he declared, 'under the protection of the Prince Regent and of the laws of England,' but Captain Maitland, before receiving Napoleon on board, informed him that he could give him no assurance concerning his future fate. On the 24th the ship entered Torbay. Napoleon expressed disappointment that he was not allowed to land in England, and his

indignation was great on learning that the English government had determined to place him for the remainder of his life in the remote island of St. Helena, under the guard of an English governor and commissioners from the allied powers. On August 7, no longer styled Emperor but General Bonaparte, he was removed to a vessel commanded by Sir George Cockburn, and landed at St. Helena on October 16, where he remained until his death in May, 1821.

After having broken his bond of abdication, and again involved Europe in war, Napoleon had no right to complain of the severity of his treatment. His captivity was more lenient than ordinary imprisonment, and was soothed by the companionship of a few attached followers; yet many Englishmen, by no means admirers of his character, regretted that the necessity for sufficient precautions against his escape caused him to be transported to that rock in the Atlantic, where his constant fretfulness embittered the remaining years of his life.¹

The Duke of Wellington used all his influence after the restoration of peace in bridling the revengeful spirit of the allies, particularly of the Prussians, eager to avenge the outrages which Napoleon had inflicted on their country. Wellington urged all the troops to bear in mind that their sovereigns were the allies of the King of France, and that France ought to be treated 'as a friendly country.' The great gallery of the Louvre had been adorned with paintings brought by Napoleon to Paris after his victorious campaigns. The princes whose states had been despoiled now demanded the restitution of these works of art, and their request could not be denied. But it was naturally painful to the Parisians to see the removal of statues and pictures which had been the pride of the city, and the English soldiers who assisted in the transfer were looked upon with much ill-will. Some reduction was now made in the extent of the French territories, and a large sum was demanded as indemnity.

To guarantee the discharge of these stipulations, an army of occupation remained for three years in France, under the Duke of Wellington. The allied armies were finally withdrawn at the close of 1818, and the duke on whom the allied sovereigns had conferred the title of Field-Marshal, now closed the active part of his military life. Continual acts of piracy committed by the rulers of Algiers had been brought under the notice of the

¹ See Horner's Correspondence, March, 1816. He was allowed to ride some miles round his place of residence. If going beyond those limits, he was to be attended by a British officer.

allied sovereigns at Vienna. For more than two centuries the Barbary States, Algiers especially, were the terror of the Mediterranean, seizing the vessels of all nations which refused to pay them tribute, and reducing the captives to slavery. It was resolved in England in the spring of 1816, to send a strong force for the repression of these outrages, and the expedition was entrusted to Lord Exmouth, who, after rescuing nearly 1,800 Christian slaves, entered upon friendly negotiations with the Deys of Tunis and Tripoli, in accordance with which they promised in future to abstain from such acts of piracy. The English fleet had, however, but just returned home when fresh aggressions from the Algerines occasioned the equipment of another British squadron in July. After Algiers had been fiercely bombarded, with much loss of life on both sides, the Dey yielded to terms and liberated nearly 1,100 captives, chiefly Italians, who were carried to their homes on the shores of the Mediterranean. This success happily checked a system of outrages disgraceful to the civilisation of the age; but the Algerines still claimed the right to declare war against any state which resisted their power, to seize merchant vessels, and exact the ransom of their crews. The French government consequently took possession of Algiers in 1830, and the city and adjoining district have remained since that time in their possession. In the train of princes who came to England in 1814 was Leopold, younger son of the Duke of Saxe-Coburg, who attracted the favourable notice of the Princess Charlotte, the only child of the Prince Regent, then in her nineteenth year. The young pair were married on May 2, 1816.

The princess was extremely popular in England, and great was the general grief at her untimely death, with that of her infant, in the following year. The Duke of York, who came next in succession, was unpopular and childless. In the course of the succeeding year, the Dukes of Clarence, Kent, and Cambridge all married German princesses, and on May 24, 1819, was born the Princess Victoria, our present Queen, daughter of the Duke of Kent and of the Princess of Leiningen.

On January 29, 1820, George III. expired at Windsor Castle, aged eighty-two, in the sixtieth year of his reign. He had passed the last ten years in utter seclusion, bereft of sight and reason. During nearly thirty years of this long reign England had been involved in war. The 'Seven Years' War' on the continent, in which she joined, did not end till 1762. The American war, beginning in 1775, continued till 1782, and that waged against France, which began in 1793, lasted, with a short inter-

val, till 1815. Notwithstanding the burdens imposed on the country by war, the growth of the national prosperity had steadily continued. Ireland had been united to England; Canada had been wrested from France, compensating in some degree for the loss of the United States; a new and immense empire had been acquired in India; and Australia, the eastern coast of which had been discovered by Captain Cook in 1770, and which was at first valued merely as a receptacle for criminals, had become the home of an increasing and thriving population. The deplorable neglect of popular education had, before the beginning of the present century, been only occasionally relieved by the benevolence of individuals.¹ In the American province of New England the clearing of a forest was followed by the immediate erection of a school, but in this country there was no regular plan of public instruction till, in 1798, Joseph Lancaster, a benevolent Quaker, introduced a scheme of general tuition under monitors, which soon attracted the favourable notice of the king, whose declared wish that every child in his dominions should be able to read his Bible brought the new method into favour. Lancaster travelled through England to explain his plan; being a Dissenter, he opposed the use of the Catechism of the Church of England, and confined religious instruction to Bible lessons, without the addition of any sectarian comment. The clergy generally preferred the system of Dr. Andrew Bell, which inculcated the tenets of the Church of England, and was called the National system, while the schools termed British, founded by Lancaster, united children of every denomination. The king and queen and the other branches of the royal family became subscribers to Lancaster's Free School in the Borough Road, and the help thus given to unsectarian education should be noted as the most liberal trait recorded of George III. During this reign various efforts were made by philanthropists for the removal of abuses, received, however, with little encouragement by the government. Foremost among these benevolent reformers was John Howard, who, when sheriff of Bedfordshire in 1773, was so shocked at discovering the state of the county prisons that he eagerly undertook their reform. He made long and arduous journeys through England, Ireland, and the continent, undeterred by the danger of infection from 'jail-fever,'² then prevalent, in order to discover how far such mismanagement was general, and how best it

¹ Mr. Raikes, the proprietor of a newspaper, and the Rev. Mr. Stock, of Gloucester, deploring the general ignorance, first introduced Sunday school tuition. See a letter on this subject in 'The Gentleman's Magazine' in 1784.

² Mr. Howard died in the Russian Crimea, in 1790, from an infectious fever.

might be remedied. Although some improvements were effected in consequence of his reports, much evil remained even as late as 1813, when the state of Newgate attracted the notice of the benevolent Mrs. Fry. This lady found women and children, the untried and those under punishment, immured together without order or employment, and without hope of reformation. Her persevering exertions were not fruitless; great improvements were ultimately introduced into prison discipline throughout England. The criminal law was at the same time extremely severe. During many years Sir Samuel Romilly, one of the most eminent lawyers, endeavoured to enforce upon the legislature that certainty of punishment deters offenders more than the extreme severity which rendered juries unwilling to convict. At this time the private theft of five shillings was upon conviction legally followed by sentence of death. Some success at length attended his humane efforts, and his principle has since been adopted.

The long-continued war was followed by commercial distress, and consequently by the lowering of wages, and the general discontent led to large public meetings, accompanied by great clamour for parliamentary reform and the repeal of the corn-laws. One of these great gatherings of the people took place in August, 1819, at St. Peter's Field, near Manchester; the great number of persons who assembled from the adjacent districts, computed to amount to about 80,000, so greatly alarmed the magistrates that they called in military aid, and at the last moment, without warning, ordered the dispersion of the people, and the arrest of Henry Hunt and other popular leaders. A scene of violent tumult ensued, in which it appears somewhat extraordinary that the loss of life should not have exceeded, as reported, that of 'five or six persons,' besides the wounded. From the place of meeting, the name of 'the Peterloo Massacre' was given to the affray, and in consequence of the growing irritation in the country, 'Six Acts' were passed, which have long been repealed. These prohibited all public meetings without the licence of a magistrate, and placed all expression of political feeling under severe control. By one of these Acts, the stamp duty, previously a tax on newspapers, was imposed upon all papers containing comments on public affairs, and the publisher of what might be termed a seditious libel was liable to transportation on a second conviction. These measures, according to moderate writers, brought 'unspeakable odium on the government, and increased the ferment which they were intended to repress.'¹

¹ See Campbell's 'Life of Lord Chancellor Eldon,' p. 352.

Although the reign of George III. was a period unfavourable to the progress of art, the king, during his earlier years, bestowed some encouragement on both music and painting. The great painter, Sir Joshua Reynolds, is said to have been 'the first Englishman who added the praise of the elegant arts to the other glories of his country.'¹ Shortly after the commencement of this reign, the first public exhibition of pictures took place in London; and in 1768 the Royal Academy was founded for the encouragement of art, of which Sir Joshua Reynolds, who was at that time knighted, was the president. The king took much interest in the new society, and reserved for its use a part of Somerset House, in the Strand, in which the annual exhibitions of pictures took place for many years.

Towards the end of the reign the streets of London and of other principal towns were made more secure and convenient by the substitution of gas for the feeble light of oil lamps. Pall Mall, which is said to have been lighted by gas in 1807, remained for some years the only street in which that improvement was adopted. From the beginning of this century, steam engines were brought into use to impel vessels on rivers, both in America and England, but it was not until the next reign that railway trains began to supersede stage-coaches, which had been carried to great perfection in England.

The death of the old king, who had been totally unable for the past ten years to take any part in the administration, made no alteration in public affairs, but did not tend to lessen the sovereign's unpopularity. George IV. was fifty-eight years of age when he inherited the throne, having been Prince Regent since 1811. Only a month after his accession, the country was shocked by the discovery of a plot against the lives of the ministers, who were intending to hold a cabinet dinner at the house of Lord Harrowby. This conspiracy, which was called, from the place where it was hatched, 'the Cato Street Plot,' was happily disclosed in time to prevent the attack, and five of the conspirators were executed for high treason. Such an act of sedition usually tends to check the immediate progress of reform by uniting all parties in favour of the measures needful for the protection of order.

The next subject of public interest added to the king's unpopularity. The Princess of Wales, whose marriage had been so unfortunate, became legally the Queen of England, but the king, who had from the first conceived the strongest aver-

¹ The words of Edmund Burke, whose eulogium appeared in the public papers the day after Reynolds's death.

sion to her, wished to exclude her from the rightful privileges of her rank. By his direction, the queen's name was struck out of the public prayer in the liturgy; and an offer was made that if she would remain on the continent without adopting the title of queen, an income of £50,000 per annum should be allowed her. The queen spurned the proposal, returning to England in June, 1820, where she was received with warm acclamations. The king, who anxiously desired a divorce, immediately took proceedings against her in Parliament, based chiefly on the evidence of foreigners of little repute, who had been employed to watch her conduct during her long residence on the continent. This unfortunate princess had been treated with great kindness by the late king, her uncle, and she had been viewed with especial interest by the people, both as the mother of the Princess Charlotte and as the neglected wife of an unpopular prince. Her conduct had been undignified, and she had been more unrestrained in her intercourse with inferiors than was becoming in a person of exalted rank. But when, upon the third reading, a majority of nine votes only supported the Bill of Pains and Penalties brought into the House of Lords against her, the ministry could only withdraw from further proceedings in connexion with it. Unfortunately, the queen was not satisfied without seeking a further triumph. Preparations being made in the next year, 1821, for the king's coronation, she claimed a legal right to participate in the ceremonial, but this was denied by the privy council. The coronation took place on July 19, when the queen tried personally to obtain admittance as a spectator, and was refused admission. Mortification at this repulse has been thought to have occasioned the illness which resulted in her death on August 7. The funeral took place at Brunswick, where she was interred in the vault of her ancestors.

In January, 1828, the Duke of Wellington became prime minister, and, a month afterwards, Lord John Russell carried a resolution in the House of Commons for the repeal of the 'Test and Corporation Acts,' by which all who abstained from taking the sacrament at church had been excluded from corporate offices. When a slight majority in the House of Commons decided against the Acts, the administration withdrew from any further opposition in the House of Lords. It appears extraordinary that an Act passed in the reign of Charles II. to exclude Roman Catholics from office, and which the Nonconformists had loyally supported against the attempts made by

James II. for its repeal, should have remained in force until 1828, when the dangers against which it was designed to guard had so long passed away.¹

The next year began with the announcement of a much more important political change. Year by year, the proposals made for what was termed 'Catholic Emancipation,' the repeal of those laws by which Roman Catholics were prevented alike from entering Parliament, and from serving in other offices, had been uniformly negatived. The Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel, the principal ministers, had been resolutely opposed to the repeal, and the present king was also long hostile to any change of policy. But the discontent in Ireland, which had been for some time encouraged by the popular oratory of Daniel O'Connell, threatened to break forth into a formidable insurrection. Fearing the commencement of civil war, the duke determined on a change of measures, and induced the king to accede to his views. An Act freeing the Roman Catholics from existing disabilities was triumphantly carried through Parliament in the month of April, although some of the Tory party still objected to the repeal. The Earl of Winchelsea thereupon, in anger, imputed to the Duke of Wellington the intention 'to introduce Popery into every department of the state,' an expression for which he refused to apologise. A duel took place between these noblemen in consequence, which ended without injury to either, the needful apology being then made. Since that time the practice of deciding quarrels by firearms has gradually fallen into disuse in England. On April 28, in an unusually full House, the Duke of Norfolk, hereditary Earl-Marshal of England, and other Catholic noblemen, took their seats among the Lords as peers of Parliament, entering at length the assembly in which their ancestors had in former times borne an important part.

The king, who had secluded himself for some time from public view, expired on June 26, 1830, and was succeeded by his brother, William Henry, Duke of Clarence. George IV. died in his sixty-eighth year, having reigned rather more than ten years as sovereign, or, including the regency, nearly twenty. Without any avowed change of general policy, the complete rejection of all reform had been of late gradually relaxed, improvements having taken place in the criminal law, at the instance of Mr. Peel, restrictions on trade having been removed, and concessions

¹ A public dinner was given in London to celebrate the 'great event' of this repeal, the Duke of Sussex, the king's younger brother, being in the chair. See H. C. Robinson's *Diary*, ii. 304.

made to Dissenters and Roman Catholics. The Duke of Wellington, although called the 'Iron Duke' from the supposed steadfastness of his will, had yielded to pressure for the sake of preserving peace, and Mr. Peel expressed his sentiment that political axioms were not 'like the great truths of morality, invariable in their application,' but must be modified according to circumstances.¹

¹ Sir R. Peel's speech on introducing the 'Catholic Relief Bill.' He had not at that time succeeded to the title of baronet. Mr. Peel, when Home Secretary, introduced the system of police, which first gave the metropolis its present efficient guards, in place of the old watchmen. Thence they derived their cant name of 'Peelers.' This force has been extended throughout England in the present reign.

CHAPTER XXXVIII.

WILLIAM IV.

A.D. 1830—1837.

As GEORGE IV. left no direct heir, he was succeeded in the sovereignty by his next brother, William Henry, Duke of Clarence, who had married, twelve years previously, the Princess Adelaide Louisa of Saxe-Meiningen.¹ Nearly sixty-five years of age at the time of his accession, and naturally inclined to a life of ease and pleasure, it is unlikely that King William IV. would have desired to make any great political changes if they had not been forced upon him by circumstances. But exactly one month after he was seated on the throne, events occurred in France which agitated all Europe, and re-kindled in England the long-sustained desire for Reform.

Charles X., who succeeded his brother Louis XVIII., having lost whatever popularity he enjoyed at Paris, endeavoured to repress all manifestations of excitement by publishing 'ordinances' which suspended the liberty of the newspaper press, dissolved the Chamber of Deputies when just assembled, and revoked certain privileges conferred by the charter of Louis. These measures, which, by some eminent French lawyers, were declared contrary to law, so far from repressing the people, excited them to immediate revolution.

After a contest of three days in the streets of Paris between the troops and the people, the king offered concessions, which were rejected; and on August 4 he withdrew with his family from Paris and again took refuge in England, whilst, by a compromise between the friends of monarchical and republican government, Louis Philippe, Duke of Orleans, a distant cousin of Charles X., was raised to the throne as King of the French, a title supposed to carry with it the consent of the people.

¹ The two daughters of this royal couple died in infancy. The Duke of York, the second son of George III., who would have inherited the crown, died in 1827.

The example of France was soon followed at Brussels, where a similar revolution resulted in the separation of Belgium from Holland.¹

The Duke of Wellington, who continued at the head of the English government, took an opportunity of declaring that Parliament deservedly possessed the entire confidence of the country; but when, in consequence of the discontent in London, the duke dissuaded the king from dining with the lord mayor on November 7, at the Guildhall, there was great excitement. A few days afterwards, a motion concerning the civil list in the House of Commons was carried against ministers, by a majority of twenty-nine,² and before the end of the month the Duke of Wellington retired from office, Earl Grey succeeding as head of an administration which came in upon the principles of 'Peace, Retrenchment, and Reform.'

Earl Grey was wellknown to be one of the most lofty-minded advocates of Parliamentary Reform. In 1806, after the death of Mr. Pitt, he took office under his friend Charles James Fox, and, on that minister's death after a few months, succeeded to the post of secretary for foreign affairs. But the ministry fell in March 1807, and since that time Tory government had prevailed. The various modes by which seats in the House of Commons were at that time obtained were indeed incongruous. In some cases a town which had dwindled into a mere village, or an estate upon which stood a farm-house, gave the office of 'Representatives' to gentlemen who were merely nominated by the wealthy owners of the property. Such places, called 'rotten boroughs,' were a fertile subject of declamation; other places, called close boroughs, were under the control of corporations or of a neighbouring aristocrat. At Norwich, Bristol, Nottingham, and other old towns, the electors were very numerous, comprising among 'the freemen,' as they were called, many of the poorest and most ignorant class, who only valued their votes because they were accustomed to sell them to the highest bidder. It was usual to keep the poll open for several days, and most towns were disgraced by drunkenness and frequent affrays of the people.

While persons who were really nominees of noblemen took their seats as representatives of the people, some of the largest towns in England—for instance, Leeds, Manchester, Birmingham,

¹ In 1831, Leopold of Saxe-Coburg, the widower of the Princess Charlotte, was elected King of the Belgians by the national representatives assembled at Brussels.

² Sir Henry Parnell's motion. The House of Commons, elected in the autumn of 1830, in consequence of the king's death, began its sittings in October.

Stroud, were without any representatives at all; all efforts, indeed, made in Parliament to redress these great inconsistencies, had been uniformly repelled by the ruling Tory party. In defence of the existing state of things was pleaded the general high character of the House, and also that, through the favour of patrons, very distinguished men had become members who might not otherwise have been chosen.

The task of introducing the first great Reform Bill, which adopted 'representation, not nomination,' as its basis, was entrusted to Lord John Russell, an ardent reformer, and great was the excitement throughout England when, on March 1, 1831, he rose to move it in the House. Fifty-six utterly insignificant places were to be disfranchised, several populous towns to receive the privilege, and about thirty members to be added to the representation of counties. According to this measure, residents only were henceforth to be capable of voting in the towns, by which the great expense of travelling, hitherto paid by the candidates, was to be saved in future, and the time during which the elections were carried on was limited to one day.¹ The debate which followed these proposals lasted for seven nights, and when at length the division took place, in the fullest House within memory, of 608 members, the ministry was supported in the rejection of the bill by the bare majority of one. Hereupon, soon afterwards, they suffered a defeat, and immediately dissolved Parliament. The result was favourable to the reformers. Lord John Russell introduced the bill again on June 24, and the House continued its sittings throughout the summer. On September 21, the bill, which was supported by a majority of 109 votes, was carried to the House of Lords. Great anxiety prevailed in London, and when, on October 7, the Lords threw it out, riots occurred in Bristol and other places, and further commotions were apprehended. It was now openly urged that by a new creation of Liberal peers alone could the divergence between the two Houses of Parliament be satisfactorily merged. In fact, during the long period of Tory rule, continual creations from that party had rendered the Lords irreconcilably hostile to this measure.

Again, however, in December, 1831, Lord John Russell brought forward a bill nearly similar to the one formerly rejected, and the House of Commons decided in its favour by a majority of 162. With great reluctance, the ministers now urged the king to add a sufficient number of new peers to the

¹ In counties where the poll had been open for fifteen days it was now to be limited to two.

Upper House. Upon his refusal, however, Earl Grey and his friends resigned their offices, but were almost immediately reinstated, William having been made aware of the crisis and of the probable consequences should he accept a ministry opposed to reform. By the exercise of his personal influence over the peers, which some advisers considered less objectionable than adding to their number, this much-debated bill at length passed, and became law on June 7.¹ Another Reform Bill, passed a few years ago, has since greatly extended the right of voting, but the great change of 1832 led the way to other important measures. A ministry which has gained popularity by the advocacy of popular rights is sure afterwards to disappoint many of its partisans, and the unthinking people who agitated in favour of reform were speedily discomfited by the disappointment of their excessive expectations. One of the measures, however, which now occupied the attention of the new Parliament was a humane Act, called 'the Factory Bill,' designed to protect the most defenceless of all classes, the little children employed in factories, who frequently suffered from the long hours of work, and who were growing up in ignorance. This Act, which passed in 1833, limited the time of labour and prohibited the employment of children under nine years of age.

Another measure advocated by the ministers, the Reform of the Poor Law, brought upon them great unpopularity. The amount of money raised for the maintenance of the disabled poor had, within fifty years, increased from less than two millions to seven; idleness and vice had also increased through a general laxity in the administration of relief. The question how best to relieve destitution without encouraging idleness and improvidence is one of the most difficult subjects which can ever engage the attention of Parliament. By the new Act of 1834 the destitute poor of adjoining parishes were swept into one large workhouse, termed the 'union.' A more popular measure was 'the Negro Emancipation Act,' passed in 1833, which enacted that on August 1 of the following year the negro children should be free, and that after a term of so-called apprenticeship, during which the slaves would continue to work for their masters, all the black population should be free. A grant of £20,000,000 was allotted as an indemnity to the planters, who urged that their estates would fall out of cultivation from want of labour. The generous acquiescence of the British people in a gift which thus increased the public burdens, excited general

¹ The first Parliament which was elected after the passing of the Reform Bill assembled in January, 1833.

admiration. The planters in the island of Antigua immediately liberated their slaves, without apprenticeship, and the negroes celebrated their deliverance from slavery on the night of August 1, by meetings for thanksgiving.

In Ireland great grievances called loudly for redress, but the difficulties of government were much increased by the pertinacious efforts of Daniel O'Connell to bring about a repeal of the Union. So long as the few things which the Irish peasant possessed—his pig, his blanket, even the pot in which he cooked his food—were liable to be seized for the payment of tithes in support of an alien Church, perpetual provocation was given to the Irish Catholics, and there remained a standing grievance as the subject of his invective.

In 1833 the government found themselves obliged to pass a 'Coercion Bill' for Ireland, by which the ordinary course of justice was in some districts suspended by the proclamation of martial law, and no political meetings were allowed. At the same time a benevolent measure for the improvement of education in Ireland encouraged the hope that the violence of party animosities might be gradually allayed. Soon after Earl Grey's accession to power, a plan was formed, under the auspices of Dr. Whately, Archbishop of Dublin, in combination with some heads of the Roman Catholic Church, for establishing schools in which Catholics and Protestants might be educated together. For this purpose, selections were made from the Scriptures and excellent school-books were prepared, with the aim of leaving the direct religious instruction to the clergy of both Churches. Violent opposition to this plan was raised by zealots on both sides; by Protestants, who declaimed against such extracts as mutilation of the Scriptures, and by Roman Catholics, who dreaded the liberalising tendency of such an intermixture. The flames of discord were fanned by O'Connell; nevertheless the plan, which was begun in 1833, had considerable success, and many thousands of children were educated by its means.

In 1835 a measure was carried for municipal reform in England—a needful supplement to the 'Reform Bill' of 1832. The election of members of the corporate bodies had been previously very unequal. In some towns all freemen possessed the suffrage, in other places members of the corporation themselves filled up all vacancies as they occurred. The report which was issued by a commission of investigation explained a variety of abuses, and, after much opposition, the bill was passed in September, 1835. An Act for the reform of municipal elections in Ireland was deferred till 1840. Statutes were passed during this

reign by which a rent-charge payable in money was substituted for the uncertain and objectionable collection of tithe in kind. Committees of Parliament had urgently recommended that relief from this obnoxious impost should be given to the people of Ireland, but this was not finally settled till the next reign.

On June 20, 1837, on the death of the king, who was in his seventy-second year, after a short illness, his niece, the Princess Victoria, ascended the throne.

According to previous stipulation, the kingdom of Hanover, which had been, since the accession of George I., united to Great Britain, but which could only by law pass to a male heir, devolved upon Ernest Augustus, Duke of Cumberland, the next surviving son of George III. This separation was on the whole popular in England, from the national dislike to possible embroilment in continental politics. King William was well beloved by his subjects, and, after his marriage with the amiable princess who survived him, had refrained from the extravagance which had been the bane of his earlier years. In December, 1834, the administration of Lord Melbourne was succeeded by that of Sir Robert Peel; but Lord Melbourne returned to power in April, 1835, and continued at the head of affairs during the remainder of the reign.

CHAPTER XXXIX.

VICTORIA.

A.D. 1837.

THE accession to the throne, on June 20, 1837, of a young princess who had just reached the age of eighteen, and who had been carefully educated with a view to her high position, awakened in the nation unusual feelings of personal attachment to their sovereign. The queen was married on February 10, 1840, to her cousin, Prince Albert of Saxe-Gotha, from whom she received for twenty-one years that true support and affection so much required in her high and lonely position.¹

The first years of the new reign were saddened by bad news from Ireland. Much had been done to allay the violence of party strife and to promote education there, but the recurrence of bad harvests and the failure of the potato crop raised an alarm of impending famine, and it was judged advisable in 1838 to extend to Ireland the system of the poor law. Since that time, the emigration of large numbers to America has caused the rise of wages, although there have been still periods of severe distress, particularly in the year 1845, when a general subscription for the relief of the Irish poor was made in England.

In 1839 an Act was passed by Parliament which has greatly contributed to encourage education, to benefit trade, and to increase the general welfare. The postage of letters, till then paid by the receiver, according to weight and distance, at a cost varying from sevenpence to a shilling, was now reduced to the uniform payment of one penny.² Members of Parliament had been exempted from this impost on the ground of business,

¹ Prince Albert died in December, 1861, much beloved and deservedly regretted.

² If not exceeding the half-ounce in weight.

and were allowed to 'frank' a certain number of letters daily; but the tax had greatly impeded free communication even among those who were not poor, and letters were frequently consigned to carriers in order to evade it. The plan of this happy reduction, which the gradual multiplication of letters has so successfully justified, was devised by Mr. Rowland Hill, who afterwards received knighthood as an acknowledgment of his meritorious labours. In the year 1839 the number of papers and letters transmitted by post was under 126,500,000; in the year 1856 the whole number of letters delivered in Great Britain and Ireland amounted to 504,421,000.

The distress occasioned by unpropitious seasons and want of employment during the year 1838 had not been confined to Ireland, and the cry which was raised in England against the new poor law added to the discontent of the working classes. Unions were formed which attempted to tyrannise over the great employers of labour, and the agitators were called Chartists, from their announcement of a charter in which they had embodied their claims. In June, 1839, a 'monster petition,' as it was termed, signed by 1,200,000 persons, was presented to the House of Commons, praying for universal suffrage and annual parliamentary elections.

Happily, some leading men of great intelligence understood the evils which pressed upon the community, and, by uniting and establishing a 'League against the Corn Laws,' were successful in averting a breach of the peace. The voice of Richard Cobden, first heard at public meetings on this great question, soon resounded in Parliament, where, in 1841, he took his seat for Stockport. Mr. Cobden, who had been previously known by writings in which he called himself 'a Manchester manufacturer,' fully explained the evil effect of duties on the importation of corn, which failed to promote the prosperity of the agriculturists, while they restrained commerce and aggravated the sufferings of the working classes. The heads of the League sent agents throughout England to investigate the condition of the people, and held public meetings for discussion. No room in London sufficing, they engaged Covent Garden Theatre, in March, 1843; and that vast house was crowded in every part with listeners to the speeches of Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bright.

The advocates of protection appealed to government to put down the League, but the ministry of Sir Robert Peel saw that argument could not be encountered by force, and became at length themselves convinced of the necessity of repealing these

obnoxious laws.¹ In January, 1846, Sir Robert proposed a new system, preparing, after three more years, to abolish the existing duties. When announcing his changed views on this subject, Sir Robert Peel handsomely acknowledged that the success of the great movement was owing to the exertions of Richard Cobden. The Anti-Corn Law League, which had been seven years in existence, triumphantly closed its meetings in July, 1846. Sir Robert Peel, who had been in office since August, 1841, gave place, immediately after the repeal of the corn laws, to the ministry of Lord John Russell.

Notwithstanding the measures lately passed for the benefit of Ireland, notwithstanding the public works for the employment of the poor, and agricultural schools for the instruction of pauper children, a spirit of seditious disaffection, the legacy of O'Connell, was rife throughout the country. In July, 1848, an affray took place between the Irish rebels and the police, in which the rebels were easily defeated, and all the leaders of the revolt, some of whom were sentenced to death, were transported. Earlier in the same year, another revolution took place in France. Serious disturbances having broken out at Paris, King Louis Philippe abdicated on February 24, and fled with his family to England. The Republic was immediately proclaimed in Paris, and at the beginning of 1852 the executive was entrusted to Louis Napoleon, nephew of the Emperor Napoleon, under the title of President of the Republic. On December 2 of that year the new President, having gained the attachment of the troops, seized the authority-in-chief, repressed opposition, and by an unwarranted fusillade upon the houses and people of the boulevards, terrified the city of Paris and took occasion to convert himself into Emperor of the French.

During the present reign England has been greatly benefited by the successive improvements made in the communication of intelligence. The latest and most wonderful discovery tending to this result is the electric telegraph. The first experiment of sending news through a tube under the ocean was tried between England and France in 1850; the failure which at first occurred being followed the next year by complete success. Had not the peculiar properties of gutta-percha been found to supply a fit coating for the wire in its passage through the sea, this valuable mode of sending intelligence would have been only possible on land.²

¹ A letter which was addressed to the League by Mr. Jones Lloyd, a wealthy banker, acknowledging the force of the arguments which were publicly advanced, made a great impression.

² See an article on the Electric Telegraph in the second volume of the 'Cornhill Magazine.'

The first great 'Industrial Exhibition,' chiefly designed by the Prince Consort, who was a great patron of art, took place in a magnificent glass conservatory, upon the scale of a palace, erected for the purpose in Hyde Park, and was opened by the queen with a brilliant ceremonial on May 1, 1851. The delighted spectators, who beheld productions from India and Turkey, besides all the countries of Europe, interpreted this interesting spectacle as an omen of universal peace. But early in the year 1853 serious differences arose between Russia and Turkey, and in the month of December an alliance was concluded by France, England, Austria, and Turkey, for the maintenance of the Turkish Empire against Russian aggressions. This was, however, speedily followed by war.

In England armaments were prepared on a larger scale than those with which the Duke of Wellington closed his campaigns in Spain, and the most interesting fact was the cordial alliance then first formed between France, the greatest military nation, and England, the greatest naval power in Europe. Napoleon III., when addressing the French troops upon their embarkation, announced that 500,000 French soldiers would be conducted to the north in English vessels.

As it was soon found that the northern coast of Russia could not be successfully assailed, the scene of warfare was transferred to the neighbourhood of the Black Sea. On September 14, 1854, the allied army landed in the Crimea, after having suffered severely from cholera at their first halting places, Varna and Constantinople. Lord Raglan was the English commander; the French were under Marshal St. Arnaud.

On the 20th the allies defeated the Russians in an engagement called 'the Battle of the Alma,' with great loss of life on both sides. The great work of the war, the bombardment of the strongly fortified town of Sebastopol, was begun on October 17. Another battle, in which the Russians again suffered defeat, took place at Inkermann on November 5. But, soon after these dearly bought victories, news reached England which caused general anxiety. About the middle of November ships carrying stores much needed by the army were wrecked in a violent storm, and, during a winter of great severity, large numbers of men and horses were perishing from the want of food, clothing, and shelter. It was also known that medical aid was greatly wanting. Every possible effort was made in England to alleviate the sufferings of the soldiers. Private subscriptions were raised, articles of warm clothing were collected, and Miss Nightingale, a lady of great energy and benevolence, who had already studied

the art of nursing, promptly organised a band of nurses, with whom she proceeded to Constantinople, planting hospitals in the best situations, and introducing improved modes of treatment. The continuance of the war and the great difficulties attending the siege broke the health of Lord Raglan, who died in the camp in June, 1855.¹ At length, on the night of September 8, after one of the principal forts, called the Malakhoff, had been taken by the French, the allies gained possession of the south side of Sebastopol. The queen, when opening Parliament on the last day of January, 1856, had the pleasure of announcing that the terms of a general peace were accepted by Russia, and in the May following there were illuminations and other signs of public rejoicing at the victorious close of a destructive war.

The year 1857 was a period of great anxiety, owing to the mutiny which broke out in the native army in India. The insurgents proclaimed the King of Delhi as their Emperor. Delhi was taken by the British forces in September, and in November Sir Colin Campbell succeeded in rescuing the British residents who had been besieged for some months at Lucknow. In the early part of 1858 the mutiny in India was completely overcome, the old King of Delhi was tried, and sentenced to banishment, and a bill was brought into Parliament transferring the government of British India entirely from the East India Company to the English government.

During the last thirty years various measures have been passed by Parliament for the public benefit. Public parks have been created; newspapers, by the removal of the stamp-duty, have been brought within the reach of all; and popular education has been widely extended.²

The destructive civil war between the Northern and Southern States of America, beginning in the year 1861, stopped the importation of cotton, and, by closing the mills in the North of England, reduced the factory hands to great distress. The patience with which they endured their severe trials won for them a tribute of general respect; and great efforts were made by the benevolent, in organising schools and distributing relief, to alleviate the heavy pressure of what was called 'the Cotton Famine.'

¹ The French general, St. Arnaud, also died soon after the battle of the Alma, when General Pelissier succeeded to the command of the French. The Emperor Nicholas of Russia also died in March, 1855, from illness supposed to have been occasioned by grief and disappointment.

² The stamp-duty on newspapers was taken off in the year 1855.

Since this time successive Acts have passed all tending in the popular direction. An extension of the Reform Bill was passed by a Conservative ministry in 1867, adding large numbers of the working class to the constituencies. In 1869 the Liberal administration effected the disestablishment of the Irish Protestant Church. In 1870 a bill passed to provide for popular education in every district of England. Local Boards were instituted on the most liberal principles to supply the deficiencies of the voluntary system; and in 1871 the Universities, once the strongholds of exclusion, were opened to all without religious tests.

The reign of Victoria has been distinguished by the gradual but marked convergence of the two great parties of the State on the essential matters of public policy.

INDEX.

ABE

ABERCROMBY, General: Battle of Aboukir bay (the Nile); death of, ii. 465
 Acre taken by Crusaders, i. 127
 Addington, Speaker, ii. 464; Pitt's successor, 466, 467
 Ægelric, Bishop, i. 62
 Agricola, Cn. Julius, i. 6, 7
 Albigenses, early Protestants, i. 153; Edict of Nantes regarding, 522
 Alcuin, i. 16, *note*
 Aldred, Archbishop, i. 56, 59
 Alençon, Duke of, i. 494, 498, 499, 500
 Alexander, Emperor of Russia, ii. 471, 473, 479, 483
 Alfgar, Earl of East Anglia, rebels, i. 41, *note*; 43, 45
 Alfred the Great, i. 20; deserted, and hides, 21; victorious at Edington, 22; reforms, 23; hospitality, 24; purchases peace, 25
 — brother of Edmund Ironside, i. 36, 37, 49
 Algiers, bombardment and capitulation, ii. 488
 Alliance, the Triple, ii. 218; the Grand, ii. 343
 Alma, battle of the, ii. 505
 America, North, discovery, i. 343; English settlements in, ii. 52, 71
 American war (first), ii. 426; Independence of United States, 436
 — — (second) ii. 478
 — civil war, ii. 505
 Amiens, peace of, ii. 465
 Angles, settlement, i. 11, 19
 Anglesey conquered, i. 6
 'Angli non, sed Angeli,' i. 12
 Anglo-Saxon manners, i. 15, 16
 Anjou, Geoffrey, Count of (Plantagenet), husband of Matilda, i. 85
 Anjou, Duke of, i. 492, 494
 Anlaff, i. 27
 Anne, wife of Richard II., i. 238
 Anne Boleyn, i. 362, 375, 383
 Anne of Cleves, i. 393, 394
 Anne, Queen, ii. 342; Grand Alliance, 343; peace of Utrecht, 357; her death, 359
 Anselm, i. 63; Archbishop of Canterbury, 77

BAR

Anson, voyage round the world, ii. 381
 Anti-Corn Law League, ii. 503
 Antoinette, Marie, execution, ii. 447
 Antoninus, Emperor, i. 7
 Antrim, Earl of, ii. 113, 115, 200
 Aquitaine, dowry of Eleanor, wife of Henry II., i. 98, 212
 Arabella Stuart, Lady, ii. 26
 Archery, English, i. 215
 Argyle, Marquis of, ii. 157; crowns Charles II., 161; his execution, 207
 — Earl of (son of the foregoing), condemned, ii. 238; escapes—returns, and executed, 251
 Arkwright, his inventions, ii. 418
 Armada, Spanish, i. 516
 Arran, Earl of, i. 399, 400
 Arthur, King, i. 11 and *note*
 Arthur of Brittany, i. 136
 Arthur, Prince, son of Henry VII., i. 340
 Articles, Act of the Six, i. 393; repealed, 415
 Arundel, Earl of, imprisoned, i. 520
 Ascelin claims payment for the Conqueror's grave, i. 70
 Ascue, Anne, a martyr, i. 404
 Athelney, Isle of, i. 21
 Athelstan, King of England, i. 26
 Atterbury, Bishop, ii. 358; his arrest and exile, 372; death and burial, 378
 Augustine, monk, lands in Kent, i. 12
 Austerlitz, battle of, ii. 471

BABINGTON (plot), i. 506
 Bacon, Francis, Lord, ii. 12; disgrace and death, 41, 42
 Bacon, Roger, i. 165
 Bailly, Mayor of Paris, ii. 444
 Ball, John, i. 231
 Balliol, Edward, i. 199
 Balliol, John, i. 174; king, and deposed, 175
 Balmerino, Lord, ii. 66, 67
 Bangor monastery, monks slain, i. 537 (Appendix)
 Bank of England, its origin, ii. 324
 Barebones, or 'Little,' Parliament, ii. 171

BAR

- Barclay, Sir George, plot against William III., ii. 328
 Baronets, order of, ii. 24
 Bartholomew's day, massacre, i. 495
 — Ejection of clergy (Act of Uniformity), ii. 209
 Barton, Elizabeth, i. 377, 378
 Basing House, siege of, ii. 123
 Battle of Aboukir Bay, ii. 465
 — Agincourt, i. 273
 — Alma (the), ii. 505
 — Argau, ii. 470
 — Assaye, ii. 470
 — Assington, i. 32 and *note*
 — Austerlitz, ii. 471
 — Bannockburn, i. 188
 — Barnet, i. 305
 — Beachy Head, ii. 305
 — Blenheim, ii. 346
 — Bosworth, i. 323
 — Bothwell Bridge, ii. 225
 — Boyne (the), ii. 307
 — Brunanburgh, i. 27
 — Bunker's Hill, ii. 426
 — Chalgrove, ii. 112
 — Copenhagen, ii. 465
 — Corunna, ii. 476
 — Crécy (Cressy), i. 207
 — Culloden, ii. 394
 — Dettingen, ii. 384
 — Dunbar, ii. 159
 — Edgehill, ii. 109
 — Edington, i. 22
 — Evesham, i. 162
 — Falkirk (defeat of Wallace), i. 179
 — — (defeat of Gen. Hawley by the Jacobites), ii. 393
 — Flodden, i. 349
 — Fontenoy, ii. 386
 — Halidon Hill, i. 199
 — Hastings (Senlac), i. 52
 — Hengstone Hill, i. 17
 — Homildon Hill, i. 259
 — Inverlochy, ii. 121
 — Jena, ii. 473
 — Killiecrankie, ii. 300
 — La Hogue, ii. 321
 — Lewes, i. 160
 — Lindesey, i. 32
 — Malplaquet, ii. 352
 — Marengo, ii. 464
 — Marston Moor, ii. 117
 — Naseby, ii. 122
 — Neville's Cross, i. 208
 — Newbury (first, 1643), ii. 113
 — — (second, 1644), ii. 120
 — Nile (the), ii. 461
 — North Allerton (the Standard), i. 92
 — Okeley, i. 18
 — Pinkie Cleugh, i. 414
 — Plassey, ii. 405
 — Poitiers, i. 214
 — Preston Pans, ii. 389
 — Quebec, ii. 403

BOL

- Battle of Ramillies, ii. 348
 — Santa Cruz, ii. 188
 — St. Alban's, i. 294
 — St. Vincent's, ii. 455
 — Salamanca, ii. 480
 — Sedgemoor, ii. 253
 — Senlac (Hastings), i. 52
 — Sheriffmuir, ii. 365
 — Shrewsbury, i. 261
 — Solway Moss, i. 398
 — Spurs, i. 348
 — Stamford Bridge, i. 50
 — Standard (the), i. 92
 — Stirling (victory of Wallace), i. 178
 — Stoke, i. 331
 — Talavera, ii. 476
 — Tenchebrai, i. 83
 — Tewkesbury, i. 305
 — Towton, i. 299
 — Trafalgar, ii. 470
 — Vimiera, ii. 475
 — Vittoria, ii. 480
 — Wakefield, i. 297
 — Waterloo, ii. 486
 — Worcester, ii. 163
 Battle Abbey, i. 54
 Baxter, Richard, imprisoned, ii. 249, 268
 Bayeux tapestry, i. 53 and *note*
 Beachy Head, naval engagement off, ii. 305
 Becket, Thomas, i. 99, 104; murdered, 112
 Bede, Venerable, i. 13, *note*; 16, *note*; i. Appendix, 538, 539
 Bedford, Duke of (Regent of France), i. 280; his death, 286
 Bedford, Earl of, Hampden's associate, ii. 92, 113
 Benefit of clergy, privilege, i. 162, 253
 Benevolence, an exaction, i. 307, 357
 Bernicia, i. 11 and *note*, 28
 Bertha of Paris, wife of Ethelbert, i. 12
 Bertrand de Born, i. 122
 Berwick taken by Edward III. i. 199
 Beton, Cardinal, archbishop of St. Andrew's, i. 398, 399; murdered, 404
 Bible, in English, Tyndale's (Cranmer's), i. 384; on view at church, but withdrawn, i. 393
 Bigod, Earl of Norfolk, i. 157
 Bigod, Earl Roger, i. 177
 Bill of Rights, ii. 289, 338
 Birmingham, riot at, ii. 445
 Bishops, trial of the seven, ii. 270
 Blake, Admiral, attacks Prince Rupert's fleet, ii. 167; action with Van Tromp, 176; victory off Santa Cruz, 188; death, burial, exhumation, 188 and *note*
 Blücher, General, ii. 486
 Boadicea, Queen of the Iceni, i. 6
 Bocher, Joan, execution, i. 428
 Bohun, Humphrey de, Earl of Hereford, i. 177
 Boleyn, Anne, her marriage, i. 375; execution, 383
 Bolingbroke, Lord, ii. 358

BOM

- Bombay transferred to England, ii. 207
 Bonaparte, Napoleon, at Toulon, ii. 452; expedition to Egypt, 459; return, 461; letter to George III., 462; Emperor of France, 468; second letter to George III., 469; enters Vienna, 471; his Berlin decree, 473; Russian campaign, 479; battle of Lützen, 480; abdication, 482; confinement at Elba, 483; battles of Ligny and Waterloo, 486; confinement at St. Helena, 487
 Bonner, Bishop of London, i. 415, 428, 469
 Bothwell, Earl of, his trial, i. 481; marriage to Mary Stuart, 482
 Bradshaw, president, ii. 141; appeal to Cromwell, 170
 Breakspeare, Adrian IV., i. 99
 Breda, convention of, ii. 150; declaration of, ii. 197
 Bretigny, treaty of, i. 217
 Bretwalda, i. 11
 Britain, conquered by the Romans, i. 2, 5, 6
 Britons, described by Cæsar, i. 3, 4
 Brittany, Duke of (appeal to Henry VII.) i. 332
 Bruce, Edward, invades Ireland, i. 188
 — Robert, i. 173, 181
 Brunswick, Duke of, manifesto on his invasion of France, ii. 446
 — Caroline of, marriage to George IV., ii. 451
 Buckingham, Duke of, sides with Richard III., i. 313, 316; opposes him, 318; executed, 319
 — Duke of (Edward Bohun), executed, i. 354
 — Duke of (George Villiers), attends Prince Charles to Spain, ii. 46; court favourite, 56; obnoxious to the House of Commons, 58; murdered, 62
 Bunyan, John, the 'Pilgrim's Progress,' ii. 206
 Burgoyne, General, surrenders at Saratoga, ii. 427
 Burgundy, division of France concerning, i. 265; murder of the Duke, 275; intervention of Henry V., 276; English alliance unpopular, 285; proposed division of France, 306
 Burgundy, Duchess of, plots against Henry VII., i. 330, 334, 340
 Burke, Edmund, Lord Rockingham's secretary, ii. 419; opposes the American war, *ibid.*; advocates financial reform, 431; impeaches Warren Hastings, 441; protests against a regicide peace, 454
 Burleigh, Sir William Cecil, Lord, i. 465; his pamphlets, 503; his death, 522
 Burley, Sir Simon, executed, i. 243
 Burnet, Bishop of Salisbury, ii. 304, 340
 Bute, Earl of, ii. 410; resigns office, 415
 Byng, Admiral, executed, ii. 401

CHA

- CABOT, SEBASTIAN, discovery of Newfoundland, i. 343
 Cade, Jack, rebels, i. 290
 Cæsar, Julius, in Britain, i. 2, 3, 4
 Caer Caradoc, i. 6
 Calais besieged, i. 208; lost by England, i. 462
 Cambray, league of, i. 347
 Camden, Lord, succeeds Earl Fitzwilliam as lord-lieutenant of Ireland; riot in consequence, ii. 451
 Campeggio, Papal legate, i. 364-5
 Campian, a Jesuit, executed, i. 503
 Canada, English conquest, ii. 403; invasion of, by the Americans, ii. 479
 Canterbury, death of Becket at, i. 112; Henry II.'s pilgrimage to, 116
 Canute, i. 31; battle of Assington and division of the kingdom, 32; king of England, 32-34
 Capel, Lord, his efforts on behalf of Charles I. ii. 132; taken prisoner at Colchester, 137; executed, 149
 Caractacus, i. 6
 Cara Menellis, i. 1
 Carausius, i. 8 *note*, 10
 Carr, favourite of James I., ii. 28
 Casket-papers, i. 483
 Cassibellan, i. 3
 Cassiterides, or Tin islands, i. 1
 Catesby, Robert, plans the Gunpowder Plot, ii. 15; mortally wounded, 18
 Catherine of Aragon, married to Prince Arthur, i. 340; afterwards to Henry VIII., 345; dies in retirement, 381
 Catherine Howard, married to Henry VIII., i. 395; beheaded, 397
 Catholic emancipation, ii. 493
 Cato Street Plot, discovery of, ii. 491
 Caxton, William, i. 326
 Cavendish sails round the world, i. 532
 Cecil, William, Lord Burleigh, i. 430; supports the Scottish Protestants, 470
 Cecil, Robert, ii. 2; made Earl of Salisbury, his death, ii. 28
 Change of style, ii. 399
 Charles V., Emperor of Germany, i. 354; Wolsey's embassy to, 354; victory of Pavia, 356; ally of Henry VIII., 401
 Charles I. of England, conduct in Spain when prince, ii. 48; his marriage to Henrietta Maria, 55; attachment to Buckingham, 56; 'The Petition of Right,' 63; his attempt to seize five members of the House of Commons, 98; his contention with Parliament for the command of the army, 102, 106; raises his standard at Nottingham, 108; defeat at Naseby, 122; parting with his eldest son, conduct towards Glamorgan and to Ormond, 124, 127; joins the Scots, 126; given up to the army, 129; taken to Carisbrook Castle, 133; trial and execution, 137-144

CHA

Charles II., his efforts to save his father, ii. 137, 144; holds a small court in Holland, 150; receives Scottish deputies at Breda, 155; discovers Montrose's expedition, 157; arrives in Scotland and guarantees the Covenant, 158; crowned at Scone by the Marquis of Argyle, 161; defeated by Cromwell at Worcester, escapes in disguise, 164; his letters to the Houses of Parliament and chiefs of the army and navy, 196; 'The Declaration of Breda,' 197; the Convention-Parliament offers him the crown, 198; his arrival, 199; execution of ten regicides, 203; the 'League and Covenant' publicly burnt, 206; execution of Marquis of Argyle, 207; his marriage to Princess of Portugal, 207; violation of his promises, 209; sale of Dunkirk, 211; plague and fire of London, 212, 213; the Dutch fleet at Chatham and Gravesend, 216; fall of Lord Clarendon, 217; triple alliance, 218; secret treaties between Charles and Louis XIV., 219, 221, 235; severity in Scotland, 225; a Popish plot, 226; Exclusion Bill, 229, 234; execution of Lord Stafford, 234; the Habeas Corpus Act, 231; trial of Lord Shaftesbury, 237; acquittal, triumph of the Duke of York, 238; popularity of the Duke of Monmouth, 238; trial and execution of Lord William Russell and Algernon Sidney, 240-241; Charles dies a Roman Catholic, 243

Charles Edward Stuart (called the Young Pretender) lands in Scotland, ii. 387; the victory of Preston Pans; enters Edinburgh, 389; reaches Derby, retires northwards, 392; defeated at Culloden, 394; escapes to France, 396

Charlotte, Princess, marriage of, ii. 488

Charta, Magna, i. 143; Lord Chatham's encomium upon, i. 148, 149

Charter of Henry I., i. 81

Charter, confirmation of, by Edward I., i. 177

Charter House priors executed, i. 380

Chatham, Earl of. (*See* William Pitt, called 'The Great Commoner')

Chaucer, i. 227, 326; his death and funeral, 428

Chauvelin, French ambassador, recalled, ii. 447

Churchill (*see* Marlborough)

Christianity in England, its introduction, i. 12; in Ireland (*see* vol. i. Appendix, 536)

Clarence, Duke of, allied to Earl of Warwick, i. 301-303; accused by his brother, Edward IV., of treason, found guilty by the House of Lords and executed, 308

Clarendon, Constitutions of, i. 105

Clarendon, Hyde, lord chancellor, ii. 205; inimical to the Presbyterians, 209; his unpopularity, 211; exile, 217

Clarendon, Lord, son of the first, ii. 305

CZA

Claudius, Roman Emperor, i. 5, 6

Clergymen, called 'Sir' (*see* Thomas Haxey), i. 245, *note*

Clive, Robert, ii. 404; Lord Clive, 407

Cobden, Richard, his speech upon repeal of Corn Laws, ii. 502

Cobham, Lord, ii. 6; his death, 10

Coercion Bill for Ireland, ii. 409

Coke, Sir Edward, ii. 19, 31, 32

Coleman executed, ii. 227

Commission, Court of High, ii. 39; abolished, 72

Commons, House of, address to Henry VIII., i. 368; increase of power, 410

Commonwealth, English, ii. 146

Congregation, the, i. 470

Conventicle Act, ii. 219

Conway, General, ii. 417, 420

Cooper, Sir Ashley, ii. 203; afterwards Lord Shaftesbury and chancellor, 222

Copenhagen, bombardment of by the British, and capitulation, ii. 474

Corn Laws, league against, ii. 502

Cornwall a distinct province, i. 345, 420

Cornwallis, Lord, his surrender, ii. 434

— Marquis, lord-lieutenant of Ireland during Irish rebellion, ii. 458

Corsica, captured by Lord Hood and Captain Nelson, abandoned, ii. 454

Courtenay, Marquis of Exeter, executed, i. 391, 437; Earl of Devon, his disaffection, 445-449; an exile, 452

Cowell's 'Interpreter' condemned, ii. 25

Covenant, the Scottish, solemn league, ii. 75; accepted by the English Parliament, 114; publicly burnt, 206

Cranmer, Thomas, Archbishop, i. 375; his consent to the usurpation of Lady Jane, 430; tried at Oxford, 458; recants, 460; withdraws recantation, execution, 461

Crimean war, ii. 504

Cromlechs, i. 5

Cromwell, Thomas, his first promotion, i. 373; vicar-general, 385; Earl of Essex, execution, 394; his measures, 396

Cromwell, Oliver, serves under Lord Essex, ii. 108; his ascendancy, 110, 117; leader of the Independents, 121, 129; defeats the Duke of Hamilton at Preston, 136; his influence, 140; lord-lieutenant of Ireland, 152; return, 156; battles of Dunbar and Worcester, 160, 163; Hampton Court palace, his residence, 165; dismisses the 'Long Parliament,' 169-170; nomination of the 'Little Parliament,' 171; 'Lord Protector,' 174; plot against his life, 175; expedition against Spanish America, 183; his plea in favour of the Vandois, 184; he attempts to form an Upper House, 187-188; obtains Dunkirk, 190; death, 190

— Henry, ii. 190, 193

— Richard, ii. 191-193

Czar Peter of Russia, ii. 337

DAN

- DANBY**, Lord, ii. 224, 228
 Danalage, i. 22, *note*
 Danegeld, i. 38
 Danes, their first invasion repulsed by Egbert, i. 17; their leader, Ragnar Lodbrog, put to death; retaliation; they murder Edmund, 19; repulsed by Alfred, 22; increased power under Ethelred II., massacre of Danes, 30; Sweyn's invasion, 30; Canute, first Danish king of England, 33; fall of the Danish supremacy, i. 38; join the malcontents against William I. i. 64
 Darcy, Lord, joins Pilgrimage of Grace, 387; executed, 389
 Darnley, Earl of, husband of Mary Stuart, i. 477; his death, 479
 David of Wales executed, i. 170
 Debates, prohibition to report (*see also* 'Raikes'), ii. 423
 De Burgh, Hubert, i. 153
 Declaration of Indulgence, ii. 222; cancelled, 223; ii. 263
 Declaration of Rights, ii. 289
 Deira, i. 11 *note*, 28
 De la Mare, Peter, i. 221
 Delamere, Lord, trial, acquittal, ii. 259
 Derby, Henry, Earl of (Richard II.), Duke of Hereford, i. 247, 249
 Derby, James, Earl of, defence of Lathom House, ii. 117; executed, 164
 Delhi, capture of, by the British, ii. 505
 Desmond, Earl of, i. 501, *note*
 Despencers, i. 189, 192
 Directory, French, overthrow of, ii. 462
 Domesday Book, i. 68
 Dover, affray at, i. 39, 40
 Drake, Francis, i. 499, 501, 502; fights the Armada, 514
 Drogheda, storm of, ii. 153
 Druids, i. 4, 5, 6
 Dudley, executed, i. 346
 Dudley, Lord Guildford, executed, i. 449
 Dundee, Marquis of (Claverhouse), ii. 250, 300
 Dunstan, Archbishop, i. 28
 Dutch naval victory ('The Four Days' Battle'), ii. 215; the Dutch fleet ascends the Medway to Chatham, and reaches Gravesend, 216

EADGYTH, i. 39 (*see* Edith)

- Eadric the Wild, i. 64
 Ealdgyth, wife of Harold, i. 44, 45
 Ealdorman, authority of, i. 18 *note*, 25 *note*, 35
 East-Anglia, kingdom, i. 11; taken possession of by the Danes, i. 19
 Ecclesiastical Court, distinct from the ordinary tribunal, i. 102
 Edgar, called the Peaceful, i. 27; homage of vassal kings, 29; his laws restored, 33-34 and *note*

ELF

- Edgar Etheling, great nephew to Edward the Confessor, i. 55; submits to William the Conqueror, 56, 58; retires to Scotland, 60
 Edith, daughter of Earl Godwine, wife of Edward the Confessor, i. 39, 40, 44
 Edmund, King of East Anglia, killed by the Danes, i. 19
 — King of England, succeeds Athelstan, i. 27
 — Ironside, son of Ethelred, divides the kingdom with Canute; his death, i. 32
 Edred succeeds his brother Edmund, i. 27
 Edward (the Elder), son of Alfred, i. 26
 Edward the Martyr, succeeds Edgar, i. 29, 30
 Edward the Confessor, son of Ethelred, i. 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 44, 47; death, 48; canonised, *ib. note*
 Edward the Etheling, outlaw, nephew of Edward the Confessor, comes to England and dies, i. 42, 43
 Edward I., son of Henry III., i. 167; his conquest of Wales, 169; improvement of the law, statute of mortmain, 171; his relations with Scotland, 173; preparations for war in Scotland, 181; grand pageant at the Temple Church and knighthood of Prince of Wales, 181; his death, 182
 Edward II., i. 184; his partiality for Gaveston, 185; enters Scotland with a large army, and is defeated by King Robert Bruce at Bannockburn, 188; opposed by Queen Isabella, 191; deposed and put to death, 193
 Edward III. proclaimed king when fourteen years of age, i. 195; married to Philippa of Hainault, 197; his victory over the French at Cressy, 207; takes Calais, 208; important statute concerning high treason, passed by 'the Blessed Parliament,' 225
 Edward the Black Prince, i. 206, 212, 215, 220
 Edward IV., i. 299; his marriage to Elizabeth Woodville, 301; deposed, 302; restored, 304; his death, 309
 Edward V., his secret murder, i. 318
 Edward VI., his birth, i. 389; his accession, 411; crowned, 412; favours the usurpation of Lady Jane Grey, 420
 Edwig, brother of Edmund Ironside, assassinated by Canute, i. 33
 Edwin, Earl of Mercia, son of Alfgan, i. 45, 49, 50, 51; submits, 57; slain, 63
 Edwy, i. 27
 Egbert, King of Wessex, i. 17
 Egypt, invasion of, by General Bonaparte, ii. 459
 Eikon Basileke, ii. 149
 Electric telegraph, discovery of, ii. 503
 Elfeah, old English saint, i. 62
 Elfgiva, wife of Ethelred II., i. 30

ELP

- Elphege, Archbishop, slain, i. 31
 Elizabeth Tudor, her birth, i. 376; declared incapable of inheriting the crown, i. 383; named by Henry VIII. as heir, 429; accompanies Queen Mary to London, 437; acknowledged by Parliament as next in succession, 442; imprisoned in the Tower, 451; dismissed, favoured by King Philip, 457-463; uncertainty respecting the succession, 475; perplexity on the arrival of Mary Stuart, 485; bull against Elizabeth, 490; Rudolphi's conspiracy, 492; execution of the Duke of Norfolk, 493; the Duke d'Alençon a suitor, 499; threats of a French invasion, 504; trial and execution of Queen Mary, 507-510; Philip's projected invasion; destruction of the Spanish Armada, 513-515; revolt of Earl of Essex, 524; his execution, 527; death of Elizabeth, 530
 Elizabeth, daughter of James I., ii. 28
 Eliot, Sir John, his imprisonment and death, ii. 64
 Elliott, General, his defence of Gibraltar, ii. 436
 Ely, camp of refuge, i. 63
 Emma, wife of Ethelred II., i. 30; afterwards of Canute, 33
 Empson executed, i. 341, 346
 England divided between two monarchs, i. 36
 English constitution, its gradual development, i. 72
 English language in the Law Courts, i. 227
 Eorl, Anglo-Saxon title, i. 15
 Erskine, his defence of Lord George Gordon, ii. 433; of Tooke, Hardy, and others, ii. 448, 449
 Essex, a province of the Heptarchy, i. 11
 Essex, Earl of, lord deputy in Ireland, i. 523; his rebellion, 525
 Essex, Earl of, Parliamentary general, ii. 107; his disastrous campaign, 119; succeeded by Cromwell, 122; his death, 126
 Ethelbert, King of Kent, i. 12, 13, 14
 Ethelbald, Ethelbert, i. 18
 Ethelfled, lady of Mercia, i. 25
 Etheling, Edgar the, i. 56, 58
 Ethelnoth, Archbishop, i. 36
 Ethelred, ea'dorman, i. 25
 Ethelred, King of Wessex, i. 18, 19
 Ethelred II., 'The Unready,' massacre of the Danes, i. 30 and *note*; driven from England to Normandy, 31; victorious at Lindesey, 32
 Ethelward, i. 26
 Ethelwine, Bishop, i. 63
 Ethelwulf, king of Wessex, i. 17
 Eustace of Boulogne, i. 39, 49; rebels, 58
 Evesham, battle of, i. 162
 Exclusion Bill, ii. 230; its defeat, 233
 Exeter, its opposition to the Normans, i. 59

FRI

- F**ACTORY BILL, ii. 498
 Fairfax, Sir Thomas, afterwards Lord, presents a petition to Charles I., ii. 104; defeats the Irish invaders, 116; appointed chief general by Parliament, 122; his courtesy towards the king, 128, 130; refuses to approve the execution, 147; named general of the troops to be sent to Scotland; resigns his command, and withdraws from public life, 158; goes as a deputy to Breda, retires to Yorkshire, 198
 Falkland, Lord, ii. 105; his death at Newbury, 113
 Fawkes, Guy, Gunpowder Plot, ii. 15; his execution, 19
 Fayette, Marquis de la, captured by the Austrians, imprisoned, ii. 446
 Felton sets up the bull against Elizabeth, i. 491
 Felton, John, murderer of Buckingham, ii. 62
 Fenwick, Sir John, trial and execution, ii. 334
 Fire of London, ii. 213
 Fisher, Bishop, i. 361; trial and execution, 379
 Fitz-Osbern, minister of William I., i. 58
 Fitz-Osbert, or William Longbeard, i. 133
 Fitz-Urse, murderer of Becket, i. 112
 Fitz-William, Earl, appointed lord-lieutenant of Ireland, ii. 450
 Five-mile Act, ii. 213
 Flambard, Ralph, Bishop, i. 74
 Flanders, treaty of (with Edward III.) i. 177
 Fleetwood, Colonel, ii. 178; opposes Cromwell, 187
 Flemish refugees, i. 425
 Forest, Friar, burned, i. 390
 Forest laws (of Canute), i. 35
 Fortescue, Sir John, on English law, i. 311
 Fox, Charles James, opposes the continuance of the American war, ii. 435; in office, *ibid.*; moves the repeal of an Act affecting Ireland, 436; his coalition with Lord North, 437; his India Bill defeated, 438; upholds the rights of the Prince of Wales, 443; in office, 472; his death, *ibid.*
 Francis I. of France, i. 352
 Franks, Charlemagne, emperor of, i. 17
 Frederick, Prince Palatine (king of Bohemia), defeated at Prague, ii. 40
 Frederick the Great of Prussia seizes Silesia, ii. 383; Seven Years' War, ii. 401; its effects, 414
 Frederick, Prince of Wales, son of George II., ii. 379; his death, 398
 Friars, Franciscan (*see* Roger Bacon), i. 165

GAL

- G**ALGACUS, i. 6
 Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, i. 404; imprisoned, i. 415, 417, 426; restored, i. 438
 Garnet, the Jesuit, execution, ii. 20
 Garter, Order of the, i. 205, *note*
 Gaunt, John of, Duke of Lancaster, i. 221; pretensions, 226, 239
 Gaunt, Elizabeth, executed, ii. 257
 Gaveston, Piers, i. 183; his execution, 187
 Geoffrey, Bishop of Coutances, i. 62; suppresses a revolt, 65
 Geoffrey, Earl of Anjou (first Plantagenet), married to Matilda, daughter of Henry I., i. 85
 George, Prince of Denmark, husband of Queen Anne, ii. 343
 George I., his unpopularity, ii. 363; attempt of James Stuart, the Pretender, 367, 369; the king dies, 375
 George II., ministry of Walpole, ii. 378; descent upon the Scottish coast by Charles Edward Stuart, 379; severity towards the Jacobites, 395; fall of Walpole, 381; Pitt's administration, 407; Methodism, *ibid.*
 George III., his first speech, ii. 410; marriage, 412; deprives officers of their commissions, 417, *note*; opposes the publication of the debates, 423; overthrows Fox's India Bill, 438; loss of his reason; his recovery, 443; opposed to Catholic emancipation, 450, 464; loss of his reason, 477; his death, 488; character of his reign, 489, 490
 George, Regent, ii. 478; close of the war with France, 482; campaign of the Hundred Days, 485; bombardment of Algiers, 488; death of the Princess Charlotte, *ibid.*; Peterloo massacre, 490
 George IV., king of England, ii. 491; Cato-street Plot, *ibid.*; trial of Queen Caroline, 492; coronation, *ibid.*; repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, *ibid.*; Catholic emancipation, 493; death, 493
 Ghent, treaty of, ii. 479
 Gibraltar taken by the English, ii. 346; siege of, ii. 436
 Glamorgan, Earl of (Lord Herbert), ii. 124, 127
 Glanville, Ranulph, chief justiciary, i. 120
 Glastonbury monastery (tomb of Arthur), i. 11
 Glencoe, massacre of, ii. 317
 Glendower, Owen, i. 259
 Gloucester, Earl of, i. 161
 — Duke of, uncle of Richard II., marches upon London, i. 241
 — Duke Humphrey, claims the Regency, i. 280; quarrels with Cardinal Beaufort, 285; arrested, his death, 288
 — Duke of (Richard III.), i. 312, 317, 323
 — Duke of, son of Queen Anne, early death, ii. 338

HAR

- Godfrey, Sir Edmondbury, his death, ii. 227
 Godwine, Earl of Wessex, i. 29; his exile, restoration, and death, i. 34, 36-42
 Gordon, Adam, antagonist of Edward I., i. 162
 — Lord George, riots in London; committed to the Tower for high treason, ii. 433
 Gospatric, i. 60
 Grace, Act of (William III.), ii. 203
 Graham of Claverhouse, ii. 250
 Greenway, the Jesuit (Gunpowder Plot), ii. 19
 Gregory the Great, i. 12
 Grenville's proposal to tax the American colonists, ii. 417
 Gresham, Sir Thomas, i. 496
 Grey, Earl, succeeds the Duke of Wellington as Premier, ii. 496; resignation and re-installation, 498
 Grey, Lady Jane, i. 429; failure of Northumberland's plot, 438; her execution, 449
 Griffith of Wales conquered by Harold, i. 43, 44
 Grossteste, Bishop of Lincoln, he resists the Pope, i. 154-165
 Guisnes, meeting of Henry VIII. and Francis I., i. 352
 Gulbert, i. 66
 Gunpowder Plot, ii. 15; prosecution of the conspirators, 19
 Gurth, son of Godwine, i. 43, 44, 51; falls at Senlac, 52
 Guthrum, the Dane, i. 22
 Guy of Ponthieu, i. 46
 Gytha, mother of Harold, offers a ransom for his body, i. 53, 58, 59
- H**ABEAS Corpus Act, ii. 231; suspension of, 448
 Hadrian, Emperor, i. 7
 Halfdane, Danish leader, i. 21
 Halifax, Lord, ii. 290
 Hamilton, Marquis of, commissioner to Scotland, ii. 75; made duke, 78; imprisoned, 112; rallies the Scottish Royalists, condemned and executed, 149
 Hampden, John, ii. 64; refuses ship money, 68; charges against him, 98; engaged in the civil war, 108; his death, 112
 Handel, ii. 407
 Hanover, House of, ii. 362
 Harda-Canute, King, i. 35-38
 Hardy, Thomas, sent to the Tower on a charge of high treason; acquittal, ii. 448
 Harold, King, son of Canute, i. 35-37
 Harold, son of Godwin, i. 39, 41, 42; conquers Wales, 44; his oath, 46; elected king of England, 48; defeats Harold Hardrada at Stamford Bridge, 50; his death at Senlac, 52
 — Hardrada, king of Norway, i. 49, 50

HAR

- Harrison, Colonel, ii. 140, 169; opposes Cromwell, 175; executed among regicides, 203
- Hastings, Danish pirate, i. 24; he settles in France, 25
- Warren, his impeachment, ii. 439, 440, 441; his final acquittal, ii. 442; his retirement, 451, 452
- Hatton, Sir Christopher, a minister of Queen Elizabeth, i. 506, 520
- Haxey, Sir Thomas, i. 245
- Hazelrig, ii. 98
- Hearth tax abolished, ii. 293
- Hengist lands in Kent, i. 10
- Hengstone Hill, battle of, i. 17
- Henrietta Maria, queen of Charles I., ii. 55
- Henry I., king of France, i. 38, 39
- Henry I., king of England, i. 69; grants a charter, 81; his marriage to Matilda, 81
- Henry II., i. 98, 102; contest with Becket, 105; his humiliation at Canterbury, 116
- Henry III., accession of, i. 150; contention between the Bishop of Salisbury and Hubert de Burgh, 151; rise of Simon de Montfort, 153; Henry's oath to preserve Magna Charta, 156; the Barons' war, 159; the king's captivity, 160; Montfort justiciary, 161; reaction, 162; death of Henry, 163
- Henry IV. (Duke of Hereford, afterwards of Lancaster), his insurrection against Richard II., i. 249; ascends the throne, 255; makes war in Wales, 259; subdues insurrection in the north and executes Archbishop Scrope, 263; his death, 267
- Henry V., his popularity, 268; persecutes the Lollards, 269; war in France, 276
- Henry VI., his coronation at Paris, i. 285; his marriage to Margaret of Anjou, 287; his incapacity, 293; becomes a prisoner at St. Alban's, 294; his reverses, restoration, and death, 303-306
- Henry VII. (Duke of Richmond), parentage, i. 320; invades England, 322; crowned at Bosworth (Houses of Lancaster and York united), 328
- Henry VIII., his marriage to Catherine, i. 345; his popular character, 346; his friendship with the King of France, 352; writes against Luther, 360; endeavours to obtain a divorce, 362; disgrace of Wolsey, 367; Henry head of the Church, 373; numerous executions, 380; the Pope's bull, 381-391; Act of the Six Articles, 393
- Henry, Prince (son of James I.), ii. 24, 29
- Heptarchy, Anglo-Saxon, i. 11
- Hereward, leader of patriots, i. 63
- Herlwin, marshals the funeral of William I., i. 69
- Hertford, Earl of, Edward Seymour, brother of Jane Seymour, made a peer by Henry VIII., i. 389; considered by Henry the

INF

- chief protector of his son, 405, 407. (*See* Duke of Somerset)
- High Commission, Court of, ii. 39; abolished, 92; renewed, 260
- Hildebrand (Pope Gregory VII.), i. 101
- Hill, Rowland, author of the Penny Post, ii. 502
- Hoche, General, operates against the emigrants at Quiberon, ii. 453
- Holcroft, Thomas, popular author, indicted on a charge of high treason, ii. 448
- Holland, conquest of, by the French, ii. 447
- expedition to, under Duke of York, ii. 460
- Lord, his execution, ii. 149
- Holles, ii. 98
- Honorius, Roman emperor, i. 8
- Hooper, his execution, i. 456
- Horsa, the Saxon, lands in Kent, i. 10
- Hotham, Sir John, ii. 103
- Hotspur, Henry Percy, killed, i. 261
- Hough, President of Magdalen College, ii. 265
- Hounslow, camp of James II. at, ii. 271
- Howard, Admiral Lord, meets the Armada, i. 510
- John, his philanthropic exertions in reform of prisons, ii. 489
- Catherine, fifth Queen of Henry VIII., i. 395-397
- Howe, Lord, naval victory over the French in the English Channel, ii. 454
- Hubba, Danish leader, i. 21
- Hubert, Archbishop, justiciary, prevails against Longbeard, i. 133
- de Burgh, his fall and restoration, i. 153
- Huguenots, i. 494; their favourable reception, i. 496
- Humbert, French general, lands in Ireland, ii. 459
- Hutchinson, Colonel, ii. 197, 198; arrest and imprisonment, 210; his death, *ib.*
- Mrs., the term Puritan, ii. 54; opinion of Cromwell, ii. 177
- Hyde, Edward, ii. 82; joins the Royalists, 96, 105; becomes lord chancellor, 205
- I**CENI, i. 6
- Impey, Sir Elijah, recalled from India, ii. 440
- Independents, ii. 115
- India, Company, East, its beginning, ii. 52; Fox's India Bill rejected by George III. ii. 438; Pitt's bill for future government of, passed, ii. 439
- French possessions in, ii. 404; Clive's conquests, 405; administration transferred to English government, 505
- Indian mutiny, ii. 505
- Industrial Exhibition designed by the Prince Consort, ii. 504
- Infanta of Spain, i. 519

INK

LAN

- Inkermann, battle of, ii. 504
 Innocent III., i. 137
 Ireland in the twelfth century, i. 113, and Appendix, 536; Poynings' Act, 336; Henry VIII., king of Ireland, 407; rebellion of Earl of Tyrone, 523; his submission, 529; attempts to colonise Ulster, ii. 51; rebellion, 94; Cromwell's conquests, 155; opposition to William III., 297; his victories, 307; treaty of Limerick, 315; repeal of disabilities, 430; rebellion of 1798, 457; union with England, ii. 463
 — justice to, Fox's bill to repeal the Act of George I., ii. 436
 Ireton, General, ii. 132; command in Ireland, 156
 Irish volunteers, 1779, ii. 431
 Irishmen, United, Society of, ii. 449, 457
 Ironsides, ii. 118
- JACOBITES**, plots against William III., ii. 311-313; insurrections against George I. and II., 387, 396
 James IV., his death at Flodden, i. 349
 James V. of Scotland, his death at Solway Moss, i. 399
 James I., 'the Bye Plot,' ii. 6; conference at Hampton Court, 10; Gunpowder Plot, 15-19; the king's 'apologie,' 23; his intolerance, 27; death of Sir Thomas Overbury, 29; government by proclamation, 31; protest of Parliament, 45; his death, 49
 James II. (*see* York, Duke of, ii. 208), his accession, ii. 246; court influence at elections, 247; persecution of Baxter, 249; of Scottish Presbyterians, 249, 250; execution of Argyle, 251; Monmouth's rebellion, 252, 254-256; the Church and the Universities, ii. 260, 264-266; declaration of indulgence, 263, 268; trial of the seven bishops, 269-270; birth of a prince, 270; invitation to the Prince of Orange, 273; the prince lands, 277-281; James escapes to France, 282-286; Parliament transfers the sovereignty to William and Mary, 289; James in Ireland, 296; battle of the Boyne, 307; leaves Ireland, 308; remains in France until his death, 339
 James Stuart, son of James II., ii. 339; attempted invasion—its failure, ii. 349-356; battle of Sheriffmuir, 365; surrender at Preston, his landing at Peterhead, 366, 367; he retires to France, 368
 Jane Seymour, third queen of Henry VIII., i. 383
 Jarl, i. 15
 Jarrow, monastery at (*see* Bede i. 16, and *note*), i. 538.
 Jeffreys, Judge, his 'bloody circuit,' ii. 256; seizes the charters of towns, 242; his end, 303, and *note*

- Jemmapes, battle of (Dumouriez), ii. 446
 Jervis, Sir John, battle of St. Vincent, created Earl St. Vincent, ii. 455
 Jesuits, Campian and others arrested, i. 503; their plots, 519; connexion with the Gunpowder Plot, ii. 19
 Jews, massacre of, i. 125; banished by Edward I., i. 183; favoured by Cromwell, ii. 185
 Joan of Arc, i. 282; her execution, 284
 John, king of England, i. 135; death of his nephew, Arthur, 136; cited to Paris by Philip of France, 137; his excommunication, 139; submits and becomes the Pope's liegeman, 140; the Barons at Runnymede, 143; John signs Magna Charta, 144; renews his tyranny, 146; Prince Louis of France invited to England by the Barons, 146; John's death, 147
 Jones, Paul, his piratical attacks; takes two English vessels, ii. 429
 Josephine, wife of Napoleon Bonaparte, consents to a divorce, ii. 477
 Joyce, Cornet, carries off Charles I. from Holmby, ii. 129
 — Rev. Jeremiah, sent to the Tower on a charge of high treason, ii. 448
 Judith, niece of William I., married to Waltheof, i. 65.
 Jutes, invaders of England, i. 10
 Juxon, Bishop, attends Charles I. on the scaffold, ii. 144

- KENT**, its early civilisation, i. 4; kingdom of, 11; joined with Wessex by Egbert, 17
 — great assembly at Penenden Heath, i. 62
 — Earl of, his execution, i. 197
 Ket's rebellion, i. 422
 Kilkenny, siege of, by Cromwell, ii. 155
 Killiecrankie, battle of, ii. 300
 Knights Templars, i. 132; their destruction under Edward II., 194
 Knox, John, i. 413, *note*; resists Queen Mary of Scotland, 474

- LAMBERT SIMNEL**, personates Edward Plantagenet, i. 329, 331
 — John, tried before Henry VIII. and condemned for heresy, i. 391
 — General, in the civil war, ii. 194; banished by Charles II. 208
 Lancashire, formerly part of Yorkshire, i. 16, *note*
 Lancaster, Thomas, Earl of, i. 186; put to death at Pontefract, 190
 — Duke of, John of Gaunt, i. 221, 224, 244; his death, 249
 — House of, Henrys IV. V. VI., i. 255
 — Joseph, his system of education, ii. 489
 Lanfranc, Archbishop, i. 62

LAN

Langton, Stephen, archbishop of Canterbury, i. 137, 140, 141, 144
 Lathom House, its defence by Lady Derby, ii. 117
 Latimer, Hugh, i. 361; bishop of Worcester, 369; imprisoned under Mary, 440; his execution, 458
 Laud, bishop of London, afterwards archbishop, ii. 64; his conduct towards Scotland, 73; his imprisonment, 84-90; his execution, 120
 Leicester, Earl of, Simon de Montfort, i. 163
 — Earl of, Lord Robert Dudley, i. 472, 497-514, 517
 Leighton, the Puritan, ii. 70, 84
 Leipzig, battle of, defeat of Napoleon, ii. 481
 Leith, treaty of, i. 471
 Lenthall, Speaker of the House of Commons, ii. 99-109
 Leofric, Earl of Mercia, i. 36, 38, 39, 43
 Leofwine, son of Godwine, i. 41, 43
 Leopold, Duke, arrests Richard Cœur de Lion, i. 129
 Leopold of Saxe-Coburg, married to Princess Charlotte, ii. 488
 Lesley, General, ii. 80; becomes Earl of Leven, 93; at Marston Moor, 117; receives Charles I. at Newark, 126; gives him up to the Commissioners, 128
 Lesley, son of Earl of Leven, Scottish general at Dunbar, ii. 160
 Levellers, ii. 133
 Leyfing, bishop of Worcester, i. 38
 Lilburne, John, ii. 149, 154, 172
 Limerick, siege of, and treaty, ii. 315
 Lincoln, Stephen's defeat at, i. 94
 Lincoln, Earl, declared by Richard III. his heir, i. 321, 330, 331
 Lisbon, great earthquake at, ii. 400
 Lisle, Lady, her execution, ii. 256
 Llewellyn, his defeat and death, i. 170
 Locke, John, his pamphlet; expulsion from Oxford University, ii. 243
 Lollards, i. 258
 London, metropolis, i. 13; population, ii. 100; deprived of its charter, 239
 Londonderry, siege of, ii. 298
 Longbeard. (See Fitz-Osbert, i. 133)
 Longchamp, William, bishop of Ely, chancellor, i. 129
 Long Parliament, ii. 82; declares itself permanent, 89; dismissed by Cromwell, 169
 Lords, House of, suppressed, ii. 145
 Louis, Prince, afterwards Louis VIII. of France, invited by English Barons, i. 146
 Louis IX. (St. Louis), his censure of the provisions of Oxford, i. 159
 Louis XIV., his secret treaties with Charles II., ii. 219, 221, 223; respect paid by him to Cromwell, ii. 190; revokes the Edict of Nantes, 258; proclaims the son of James II. king of England, 339

MAE

Louis XVI., beginning of French Revolution, ii. 443; trial and execution of, 447
 Louis XVIII., his accession; flight from Paris; restored after battle of Waterloo, ii. 483-486
 Louis Philippe, abdicates the throne of France, ii. 503
 Lovell, Lord, insurrection against Henry VII., i. 329, 331
 Luddites, machine-breakers, ii. 478
 Ludlow, Edmund, regicide, ii. 302
 Luther, i. 360
 Luttrell, Colonel, elected M.P. for Middlesex in place of Wilkes, ii. 421
 Lützen, battle of (Bonaparte's), ii. 480

MACCLESFIELD, lord chancellor, in disgrace, ii. 374
 Magdalen College, ii. 265
 Maintenance, laws against, i. 331
 Major-Generals under Cromwell, ii. 182; abolished, 185
 Malcolm of Scotland, submits to Canute, i. 34
 — the Younger, i. 50; ravages the English coast, submits, 64
 Man, Isle of, under Earl of Derby, ii. 117
 Manchester, Earl of, Lord Kimbolton, Parliamentary general, ii. 117
 Manny, Walter de, i. 209
 Mansfield, lord chief justice, ii. 435
 Mantes, burned by William I., i. 69
 Mar, Earl of, his rebellion, ii. 364
 Marischal, Earl, ii. 371
 Margaret, sister of Edgar Etheling, and wife of Malcolm, i. 60
 Margaret of Anjou, married to Henry VI., i. 287; renounces her rights, 307
 Margaret, Princess, married to James IV. of Scotland, i. 339; her second marriage, 349
 Marks, Bishop, i. 252, 256
 Marlborough, Earl of, Duke, ii. 345; battle of Blenheim, 346; further success, 350; opposed by the Tories, 355; his reception by George I., 363
 — Duchess of, ii. 343, 354
 Marston Moor, battle at, ii. 107
 Mary Stuart, queen of Scotland, born, i. 309; crowned, 401; wife of the Dauphin, 417; marriage, widowhood, and return, 469, 472; marriage to Darnley, 478; birth of James I. of England, 478; Darnley's murder, 479; marriage to Bothwell, imprisoned at Lochleven, 482-3; the 'Casket Papers,' 484; takes refuge in England, 485; imprisoned at Tutbury, 489; plots against Elizabeth, letter to the queen, 492, 503-4; trial and execution, 507-9
 — Tudor, i. 359, 383; Northumberland's plot, 480; marriage to Philip of Spain, 454; martyrdom of Protestants, 464

MAR

- Mary, daughter of Charles I., wife of the Prince of Orange, ii. 91-101; mother of William III., her death, 325
 — daughter of James II., wife of William of Orange, ii. 287, 288; her coronation with William, 295; she presides over the Council in his absence, 304-305; her confidence in the naval officers, battle of La Hogue, 320, 321; death of Mary, 325; Greenwich Palace becomes a naval asylum, *ib.*
 Masham, Mrs., ii. 360
 Massey, ii. 260
 Matilda, wife of William I., i. 40, 41, 58, 59
 — wife of Henry I., i. 81
 — daughter of Henry I., i. 84; contends with Stephen, i. 94
 Maurice, Prince, ii. 105, 123
 Medina-Sidonia, Duke of, i. 575
 Melville, Lord, his impeachment, ii. 470, 471, 473
 Mercia, kingdom, i. 11
 Methodists, ii. 407
 Middlesex election, ii. 421, 425
 • Milton, John, his pamphlets, ii. 129; Cromwell's secretary, 149
 Mitchell, assassin of Archbishop Sharp, ii. 225
 Moira, Earl of, urges measures to conciliate England and Ireland, ii. 458
 Monk, General, ii. 116, 194, 197, 199; created Duke of Albemarle, 215
 Monmouth, Duke of, his popularity, ii. 229; his insurrection, 252; defeat at Sedgemoor and execution, 254-255
 Montcalm, French general, ii. 403
 Montfort, Simon de, i. 153, 161; his death, 162
 Montrose, Marquis of, ii. 92; his victories, 121; his defeat, 123; his expedition to the north of Scotland, 156; his failure and execution, 157
 Moore, Sir John, his death at Corunna, ii. 475-476
 Morcar, Earl of Northumberland, i. 45, 46, 50, 51; submits, 58, 60, 63, 64
 More, Sir Thomas, lord chancellor, i. 367; displaced, 374; executed, 379
 Mortimer, Roger, i. 191; his execution, 198
 Mortmain, statute of, i. 171
 Moscow burned, ii. 479
 Mounteagle, Lord, ii. 17
 Mountjoy, i. 527
 Mountnorris, Lord, ii. 73
 Municipia, Roman towns, York and Verulam, i. 8
 Murray, Earl of, Lord James Stuart, Regent, i. 470, 484; his death, 490
 Muir, Thomas, transportation of, ii. 448
- N**ANTES, Edict of, i. 522; revoked by Louis XIV., ii. 258
 National Debt, its commencement, ii. 323

ORA

- Naylor, James, his treatment, ii. 186
 Necker, dismissal of, ii. 444
 Negro Emancipation Act passed, ii. 498
 Nelson, Lord, ii. 454, 455; battle of the Nile, 459; of Copenhagen, 465; death and victory off Trafalgar, 470
 New Orleans, battle of, ii. 479
 Newspapers (the Armada), i. 514
 — report parliamentary debates, ii. 420; objections, ii. 423
 Newton, Isaac, ii. 265; warden of the mint, 327
 Nile, battle of (Aboukir bay), Abercomby's, ii. 465
 — — (Nelson's), ii. 459
 Nimeguen, treaty of, ii. 224
 Nonconformists ejected (Act of Uniformity), ii. 209; excluded from office by the Test Act against the wish of William III., ii. 295
 Nonjurors, ii. 294; secret correspondence with Louis XIV., ii. 311-312
 Norfolk, Earl of, revolts, i. 65
 — Duke of, i. 405
 — Duke of (adherent of Mary Stuart), his execution, i. 493
 Normandy, its first settlement, i. 38; its conquest by Henry V., i. 274
 North, Lord, ii. 424; coalition with Mr. Fox, 437
 Northumberland, Duke of, Dudley, Earl of Warwick, plot, i. 429; trial and execution, 438
 — Earl of (Henry IV.), rebels, i. 260
 — Earl of, feudal chief, i. 343
 — Earl of (Elizabeth), rebels, i. 489; executed, 494
 — Earl of, Algernon Percy, ii. 105 and *note*
 Northumbria, kingdom of the Heptarchy, divided into Deira and Bernicia, i. 11, *note*; its devastation, i. 66
 Norwich, revolt at, i. 65, 422
 Noy (ship money), ii. 67
- O**ATES, TITUS (alleged Popish plot), ii. 226; punishment, 240
 'Occasional Conformity' rendered punishable by Act of Parliament, ii. 354; Act repealed, ii. 370
 O'Coighly, priest, executed, ii. 458
 O'Connell, Daniel, ii. 493; promotes the repeal of the Union, 499
 O'Connor, Arthur, his trial, ii. 458
 Odo, bishop of Bayeux, i. 52, 53, 58; meets Lanfranc, 62; suppresses a revolt, 62; arrested and imprisoned, 67; rebellion against Rufus, 73
 Oldcastle, Sir John (Lord Cobham), his death as a Lollard, i. 269
 Oldcorne (Gunpowder Plot), ii. 20
 O'Neills, the, i. 523
 Orange, Prince of, escapes to England, ii. 447
 Orangemen, society of, ii. 451

ORD

- Ordeal, trial by, i. 70, 117
 Organ introduced into a church, ii. 209
 Orleans, siege of, Joan of Arc, i. 282
 — Philippe, Duke of, executed, ii. 447
 — Louis Philippe, Duke of, king of the French, ii. 495
 Orleton, Bishop, arraigned before a civil court, i. 191, 193
 Ormond, Marquis of, ii. 127, 138, 166, 189
 Overbury, Sir Thomas, ii. 29
 Oxford, provisions of, i. 157; condemned by Louis IX., i. 159
 Oxford, ii. 104
 — Earl of, his treatment by Henry VII., i. 342

PALMER, REV. FYSCHÉ, transported, ii. 448

- Parker, Richard, heads the mutiny at the Nore, ii. 456; his execution, 457
 Paris, capitulation of, ii. 486
 Parker, Roman Catholic, president of Magdalen College, ii. 266
 Parliament, introduction of popular representatives by Simon de Montfort, i. 161, 169, *note*; completely formed; its privileges, i. 178; forty-shilling freeholders, 298; United, royal address, ii. 465
 Partition treaties (Spanish succession), ii. 336, 337
 Paul, Emperor of Russia, ii. 465
 Peacham, ii. 30
 Peel, Sir Robert, ii. 493; Catholic Relief Bill, 494; repeal of the Corn Laws, 502, 503
 Pembroke, Earl of (Henry III.), administrator, i. 150
 Penalties for non-attendance at church, i. 502; ii. 14
 Penenden Heath, arbitration between Odo and Lanfranc, i. 62
 Penn, William, his trial and acquittal, ii. 220; he founds the colony of Pennsylvania, 244
 Perrers, Alice, i. 222-230
 Peterborough Cathedral, i. 114
 — Earl of (Charles Mordaunt), takes Barcelona, ii. 347
 Peters, Hugh, Puritan preacher, executed as a regicide, ii. 203, *note*
 Petition, Millenary (James I.), ii. 3
 Petition of Right, ii. 60
 Petitioners and Abhorers ('Exclusion Bill'), ii. 232
 Petre, Father, chaplain of James II., ii. 267
 Philip Augustus of France summons King John to Paris, i. 137; plans the invasion of England, 139
 Philip II. of Spain married to Queen Mary, i. 454; intercedes in favour of Elizabeth, 463; sends the Armada, 515; his death, 522
 Phœnicians on coast of Cornwall, i. 1, 2

QUI

- Picts, the, i. 7
 Pilgrimage of Grace, i. 387
 Pitt, William, ii. 381; minister of George II., ii. 402, 407; succeeded by Lord Bute, 413; denies the right of England to tax America, 419; raised to the earldom of Chatham, 421; his last speech, death, and interment at Westminster Abbey, 428
 Pitt, William, son of Lord Chatham, adverse to the American war, ii. 434; prime minister, 438; India Bill, 439; foreign policy, 446; Irish policy, Catholic emancipation, 449, 450; war with France, 461; union of Great Britain and Ireland, 463; the peace, 465; renewed war policy, 467, 469; at Guildhall, 470; his death and burial, 472
 Plague, the, ii. 212
 Plantagenet, origin of the name, i. 85
 Pole, Michael de la, Earl of Suffolk, i. 240
 Pole, Reginald, cardinal, i. 384; his reception, i. 455
 Poor-law reform, ii. 498
 Popish Plot, ii. 226
 Porteous, Captain, riots at Edinburgh, his fate, ii. 379
 Portland, Duke of (Bentinck), ii. 328-334
 Post, Penny, ii. 501
 Pound, his treatment, ii. 14
 Poynings, Sir Edward, governor of Ireland, his Act, i. 336
 Præmunire, statute of, touching Papal bulls, i. 366
 Pragmatic Sanction, war concerning, ii. 382; end of the war, 398
 Presburg, treaty of, ii. 471
 Presbyterians oppressed, ii. 73; ejected by the Act of Uniformity, ii. 209
 Press, its freedom under William III., ii. 326; confirmed, 423
 Pretender, the elder, James Stuart, son of James II., claims the English crown on the death of Queen Anne, ii. 364. (*See* James Stuart, ii. 339)
 Pretender, the younger (*see* Charles Edward), lands in Scotland, ii. 387
 Pride, Colonel, expels Royalists from House of Commons, ii. 140
 Priestley, Dr., destruction of his library, ii. 445
 Provisions of Oxford, i. 157
 Provisors, statute of, i. 223
 Prynne, his treatment under Laud, ii. 70; intercedes for Charles I., ii. 139
 Puritans, their intolerance, ii. 43; a term of reproach, 54
 Pym, John, ii. 78-98; his death and funeral, 113

QUAKERS, their persecution, ii. 186

Quebec, capture of, ii. 403

Quibéron Bay, unfortunate expedition of French Royalists aided by England, ii. 453

RAG

- RAGLAN**, Lord, general, ii. 504, 505
Ragnor, Lodbrog, i. 49
Raikes, newspaper editor, ii. 378
Raikes, son of the above, introduction of Sunday-schools, ii. 489, *note*
Raleigh, Sir Walter, i. 518; imprisoned in the Tower, ii. 7-9; his expedition to South America, execution, ii. 37
Ralph, Earl of East Anglia, his revolt, i. 65
Reed, Alderman, i. 403
Reform Bill, ii. 422, 436, 497, 498
Remonstrance, the Grand, ii. 95
Richard I. Cœur de Lion, crusader, i. 125; arrest and imprisonment, 129; enthusiasm in England on his behalf, 131, 132
Richard II., his intrepidity during Tyler's insurrection, i. 234; subsequent tyranny and overthrow, 245
Richard III., his seizure of the crown, i. 314; marriage, 312-317; invasion of Henry of Richmond, 322; Richard's death on Bosworth Field, 323
Richmond, Earl of, becomes Henry VII., king of England, i. 323
Ridley, bishop of London, i. 428; his martyrdom, 459
Ripon, English and Scottish commissioners at, ii. 81
Rivers, Lord, i. 312-314, 326
Rizzio, David, i. 478
Roads, Roman, i. 9
Robert, Duke of Normandy, i. 38
Robert of Jumièges, Archbishop, i. 39-42, 50
Robert de Comines, killed at Durham, i. 68
Robert, eldest son of William I., rebels, i. 68; inherits Normandy; a crusader, 69-75; contest with Henry I. and imprisonment, i. 83
Robert of Belesme rebels against Henry I., i. 82
Robin Hood of Sherwood Forest, i. 164
Rochelle, fall of, ii. 63
Rochester besieged by William Rufus, i. 74
Rockingham, Marquis of, his ministry, ii. 419, 420; his return to office, and death, 435, 436
Rodney, Admiral, his victory, ii. 436
Roger, Earl of Hereford, revolts, i. 65
Rogers, his martyrdom, i. 457
Romney secured by William I., i. 55
Roundheads, appellation of the Puritans, ii. 82
Rudolphi's conspiracy against Queen Elizabeth, i. 492
Rupert, Prince, ii. 105; dismissed, 123; becomes a pirate, 154-167; commander of the English fleet, 215
Russell, Admiral, his victory of La Hogue, ii. 321
Russell, Lord William, supports the Exclusion Bill, ii. 232; tried for complicity in the Rye House Plot, and executed, ii. 240

SOM

- Russell**, Lord John, ii. 497, 498, 506
Rye-house Plot, ii. 240
Ryswick, peace of, ii. 385

SACHEVERELL, Dr., his trial, ii. 353
Salisbury, Countess of, mother of Cardinal Pole, her execution, i. 391-396
St. Martin's Church, Canterbury, i. 12
St. Patrick, i. *See* Appendix, p. 535
Sancroft, Archbishop, ii. 260; a non-juror, 285-293; his retirement, 314
Sanctuary, privileges of, i. 153, 315, 343
Saragossa, defence of, ii. 476
Saratoga, surrender of Gen. Burgoyne at, ii. 427
Sarsfield, General, ii. 309; his departure to France, 315
Savoy, Duke of, persecutor of the Vaudois, ii. 184
Sawtre, William, first Lollard martyr, i. 258
Saxons, their settlement in England, i. 8-10
Schomberg, General, ii. 301
Scots originally from Ireland, i. 7
Scotland, Edward's decision concerning the king, i. 174; Act passed in favour of general education, i. 404; union with England, ii. 349
Scrope, Archbishop of York, executed, i. 263
Sebastopol, ii. 504
Sebert, King, dedicates a church, i. 14
Selsey, monastery of, i. 14
Selden summoned before the Court of High Commission, ii. 39, 41, 45
Service-Book imposed on Scotland, ii. 73
Settlement, Act of (succession of the House of Hanover), ii. 338
Seven Years' War, ii. 401; its conclusion, 414
Seymour, Lord, uncle of Edward VI., his execution, i. 418
Seymour, Jane, third wife of Henry VIII., her death, i. 389
Shaftesbury, Lord (*see* Ashley Cooper), his part in passing Habeas Corpus Act, ii. 231; advocates Exclusion Bill; encourages belief in Popish Plot; tried and acquitted, 237
Sheridan impeaches Hastings, ii. 441
Ship-money refused by Hampden, ii. 68; declared illegal, 85
Shire-court, i. 72
Sidney, Sir Philip, i. 511
Sidney, Algernon, his trial and death, ii. 241
Silures, tribe, headed by Caractacus, i. 5
Simnel, Lambert, an impostor, i. 331
Siward, Earl, i. 38, 39, 40, 43
Slavery in early England, i. 14, 71
Smith, Sir Sidney, operates against Bonaparte, ii. 460, 461
Somers, John, framer of 'the Declaration of Right,' ii. 289; lord chancellor, 323

SOM

- Somerset, Duke of, i. 288, 293, 395
 — uncle of Edward VI. and Protector, ii. 411-415; his fall and execution, 423, 426
 — Lord and Lady, suspected of having poisoned Sir Thomas Overbury, ii. 29
 Sophia, Electress of Hanover, successor of Queen Anne, ii. 338
 South Sea Bubble, ii. 373
 Southampton, Earl of, i. 524; his trial, 526
 Stafford, Lord, his execution, ii. 234
 Stair, Master of, concerned in the massacre of Glencoe, ii. 317
 Stamp Act provokes the American War, ii. 417; its repeal, 419
 Stamp duty on newspapers, ii. 361
 Stanhope, Lord, inventor, ii. 455
 Stanley, Sir William, his execution, i. 336
 Stanley, Lord, crowns Henry of Richmond at Bosworth, i. 323
 Star Chamber, Court of, i. 332; ii. 38, 69; abolished, 92
 Stephen, King, i. 91
 Stigand, Archbishop, i. 41, 47, 56, 58
 Strafford (*see* Wentworth), lord-lieutenant of Ireland, his execution, ii. 64-90
 Straw, Jack, concerned with Wat Tyler, i. 234
 Strongbow, Irish chief, i. 114
 Stroud, i. 98
 Stuart, Lady Arabella, ii. 26
 Suetonius, i. 6
 Suffolk, Earl of, negotiates Henry VI.'s marriage, i. 287; his death, 290
 — Duke of, father of Lady Jane Grey, executed, i. 440
 Surajah Dowlah, defeated at Plassey, put to death by Meer Jaffier, ii. 406
 Surrey, Earl of, executed, i. 405, 406
 Svend, king of Denmark, aids the English rebels, i. 68
 Sweyn, son of Godwine, i. 39, 40

TAILLEFER, i. 52

- Taignmouth burnt, ii. 308
 Test Act, ii. 223, 295; repealed, 492
 Thane, i. 15
 Theodosius, Emperor, sends the last Roman aid, i. 8
 Thingamen, i. 34
 Thorney Island, i. 14, 47
 Throgmorton, Sir Nicholas, his trial and acquittal, i. 452
 Thurston, archbishop of York (battle of the Standard), i. 92
 Tillotson, Archbishop, ii. 313
 Tilsit, treaty of, ii. 473
 Toleration Act (William III.), ii. 294
 Tooke, Horne, tried for high treason, ii. 448, 449
 Torrington, Lord, ii. 305, 311
 Tostig, son of Godwine, i. 43-47, 49

WAL

- Toulon, siege and capitulation of, ii. 452
 Tournament at Châlons, i. 167
 Townshend, Charles, ii. 424, *note*
 Treason, high, Act concerning, passed by 'the Blessed Parliament,' i. 225
 Tresham, conspirator in Gunpowder Plot, ii. 16; his death, 19
 Triple Alliance (England, Holland, and Sweden), ii. 218
 Tudor, Mary, sister of Henry VIII., first married to Louis XII. of France, afterwards to the Duke of Suffolk, i. 349
 — Owen, second husband of Catherine, widow of Henry V., i. 320
 Tyler, Wat, i. 232-234
 Tyndale, his translation of the Bible, i. 384
 Tyrconnell, Lord, opposes William III. in Ireland, ii. 295; goes to France, 309
 Tyrone, Earl of, his rebellion and victory in Ireland, i. 523-527; his submission and pardon, 529

ULM, capitulation of, ii. 469

- Ulster colonised, ii. 51
 Uniformity, Act of, i. 469; enforced, 489, ii. 209
 United States, independence acknowledged, ii. 437
 Utrecht, treaty of, ii. 357

VALENTINIAN, Emperor, i. 8

- Van Artevelde, his power in Flanders, and death, i. 236
 Vane, Sir Henry, opposed to Presbyterian bigotry, ii. 114; not included in the indemnity at the Restoration, 202; his execution, 208
 Vikings, i. 10
 Villars, Marshal, opponent of Marlborough, ii. 352
 Victoria, Princess, ii. 488, 500
 — Queen, ii. 501-506
 Vienna, congress of, ii. 485
 Villeins, i. 15
 Villeinage (insurrection under Tyler), i. 231; its gradual suppression, 236
 Villeneuve, French admiral, ii. 470
 Vimiera, battle of, ii. 475
 Vittoria, battle of, ii. 480
 Voltaire, ii. 401
 Volunteers, enrolment of, ii. 446
 Vorstius, his expulsion, ii. 27
 Vortigern, i. 10, 11

WAGER of battle, i. 117, 248, 310

- Walcheren, disastrous expedition to, ii. 477
 Waldenses, or Vaudois, ii. 183, 313
 Wales, conquered by Harold, i. 44; conquest by Edward I., i. 178, 180

WAL

- Walker, Rev. George, thanked for the defence of Londonderry, ii. 302
 Wall, Roman, i. 7
 Wallace, William, his career and execution, i. 178, 180
 Waller, Edmond, his plot in favour of Charles I., ii. 111
 Waller, Sir William, his defeat, ii. 112
 Walpole, Sir Robert, his pacific influence, ii. 373; created Earl of Orford, 382
 Walsingham, Sir Francis, minister of Elizabeth, i. 504-506
 Waltheof, son of Siward, i. 43, 46, 58; rebels, 64; marries Judith, 65; rebels, executed, 66
 Walworth, William, mayor of London, stabs Wat Tyler, i. 234
 Warbeck, Perkin, an impostor, his execution, i. 339
 Warrant, general, used in case of John Wilkes, ii. 417; resolution against, 420
 Warrenne, Earl of Surrey, deputy of Edward I., i. 176
 Warwick, Earl of, Edward Plantagenet, executed, i. 339
 — Earl of, called 'the King-maker,' i. 295, 301, 303; slain in the battle of Barnet, 305
 — Dudley, Earl of, suppresses Ket's rebellion, i. 423; becomes Duke of Northumberland, 426. (*See* Northumberland)
 Washington, George, American officer, ii. 399, 426, 427
 Wedgewood, ii. 418
 Wellesley, Sir Arthur, general, his success in India, ii. 470; in Portugal, 475; and Spain, 476, 480; invades France, 482, 483
 Wellington, Duke of, ii. 483; battle of Waterloo, 486; occupation of France, 487; prime minister, 492; Catholic emancipation, 493; duel with Lord Winchelsea, 494; defeated and retires, 496
 Wentworth, Peter, i. 531
 Wentworth, Sir Thomas, president of the Council of the North, ii. 64; lord deputy of Ireland, 72; created Earl of Strafford, 78; his trial and execution, 85, 90
 Weregild, fine paid for murder, i. 15; *note*, 71
 Wesley, John, founder of Methodism, ii. 407, 409
 Wessex, ruled by the House of Cerdic, i. 11; freed from the Danes by Alfred, i. 22; submits to Canute, i. 33
 Westminster Abbey, built on Thorney Island, i. 14
 Westmoreland, Earl of, descendant of the great Earl of Warwick, i. 489; escapes to Flanders, 493
 Westphalia, government of, ii. 473
 Wexford, massacre of, under Cromwell, ii. 153
 Weyland, Chief Justice, i. 171
 Whig and Tory, first use of the terms, ii. 232, and *note*; difference of principles in relation to the Revolution, ii. 286

WOR

- Whitby, council at, i. 537; Appendix
 Whitelock, commissioner of the great seal, ii. 168 *note*, 171
 Whitfield, Methodist leader, ii. 408
 Whittington, Richard, lord mayor of London, i. 279
 Wilfrid, Bishop of Selsey, near Chichester, i. 14
 Wilkes, John, his prosecution, ii. 416; expelled from House of Commons, 417; his triumph, 422; allowed to take his seat, 425; elected lord mayor, *ibid.*
 William of Normandy, i. 39; his visit to England, 40; his reception of Harold, 46; message to Harold, 49; lands at Pevensey, 51; his success at Senlac, 52; crowned king, 56; builds the Tower of London, 57; conquers the West, 59; rebellion in the North, and massacre of Normans, 60; wastes the North of England, 61; arbitration upon bishops' claims, 62; revolt at Ely, 63; wastes Hampshire, 63; submission of Malcolm, 64; revolt in the East, 65; executes Waltheof, 65; Domesday book, 68; his deathbed and funeral, 69
 William Rufus, strife with his brother, i. 74; death in the New Forest, 79
 William, Prince, son of Henry I., lost at sea, i. 84
 William, Prince, son of Duke Robert, i. 83-84
 William the Lion, King of Scotland, i. 115, 116
 William Longbeard, i. 133
 William of Wykeham, i. 223
 William of Orange, his marriage to Princess Mary of England, ii. 224; invited to England, 273; lands in Devonshire, 277; accepts the crown, 290; crowned with Queen Mary, 295; accepted by Scottish Parliament, 299; battle of the Boyne, 307, 308; returns to England, success of Marlborough in Ireland, 310; discovery of a Jacobite plot, 311-313; treaty of Limerick, 315; battle of La Hogue, 321; Barclay's plot against William, 328; peace of Ryswick, 335; settlement of the crown on the House of Hanover, 338; his death at Hampton Court, 340
 William IV., his accession, ii. 495; reform of Parliament, ii. 498
 Wimund, monk, declines preferment, i. 66
 Winchelsea, Archbishop, i. 176, 177
 Windebank, ii. 84
 Witenagemot (Witan), its origin, i. 17, 18, *note*
 Wolfe, General, his success at Quebec and death, ii. 402, 403
 Wolsey, Thomas, his rise, i. 349; created cardinal, 350; his conduct respecting Henry's divorce, 362, 364; his fall and death, 367, 370
 Worcester, burned, i. 38

·WOR

Worcester, Charles II. defeated at, ii. 163
 Wulf, Wulfnoth, Harold's kith, released on
 William's death, i. 69
 Wulfstan, Bishop, i. 49
 Wulstan, Bishop of Worcester, defeats
 rebels, i. 74
 Wyatt, Sir Thomas, rebellion, i. 445;
 execution, 452
 Wyclif, i. 224, 236, 239
 Wynter, Admiral, i. 470

YORKSHIRE petition, the, ii. 431
York, capital of Roman Britain, i. 8
 — House of, i. 226, 253 *note*, 294
 — Richard, Duke of, rebels against Henry
 VI. i. 294, 296; his death at Wakefield, 297
 — Duke of, brother of Edward V., his

·YOR

supposed murder, i. 318; personated by
 Perkin Warbeck, 335
York, James, Duke of, secret marriage to
 Anne Hyde, ii. 208; conversion to
 Roman Catholicism, 218; avowal of his
 religion, 223; his eldest daughter
 married to William of Orange, 224;
 'Popish Plot,' 226; leaves England,
 228, 229; Exclusion Bill, 230; thrown
 out in House of Lords, 233; adminis-
 tration in Scotland, severity towards
 the Covenanters, 237; reaction—return
 to London, 238; his second daughter
 married to Prince George of Denmark,
 243; again lord high admiral, *ib.*
 — Frederick, Duke of (son of George III.),
 ii. 447

THE END.

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY
REFERENCE DEPARTMENT

**This book is under no circumstances to be
taken from the Building**

[illegible]

